BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION



STATE OF CALIFORNIA



COMMISSIONER CLIFF RECHTSCHAFFEN and ASSISTANT CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHELLE COOKE, presiding

| |) | EVIDENTIARY |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| |) | HEARING |
| |) | |
| Order Instituting Investigation on |) | |
| the Commission's Own Motion to |) | |
| Consider the Ratemaking and Other |) | |
| Implications of a Proposed Plan for |) | |
| Resolution of Voluntary Case filed |) | |
| by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, |) | |
| pursuant to Chapter 11 of the |) | Investigation |
| Bankruptcy Code, in the United |) | 19-09-016 |
| States Bankruptcy Court, Northern |) | |
| District of California, San |) | |
| Francisco Division, In re Pacific |) | |
| Gas and Electric Corporation and |) | |
| Pacific Gas and Electric Company, |) | |
| Case No.19-30088. |) | |

REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT
San Francisco, California
February 28, 2020
Pages 513 - 796
Volume - 4

Reported by: Rebekah L. DeRosa, CSR No. 8708 Ana M. Gonzalez, CSR No. 11320 Carol Ann Mendez, CSR No. 4330

| r | - | |
|----|---|------------|
| 1 | INDEX | |
| 2 | WITNESSES: | PAGE |
| 3 | WIINESSES. | FAGE |
| 4 | JASON WELLS Direct Examination Resumed By | 516 |
| 5 | Mr. Weissmann Cross-Examination By Ms. Kelly | 518 |
| 6 | Cross-Examination By Mr. Geesman Cross-Examination By Ms. Sheriff | 556 |
| 7 | Cross-Examination By Mr. Abrams Cross-Examination By Mr. | 587 619 |
| 8 | Finkelstein | 647 |
| 9 | Cross-Examination By Mr. Alcantar | |
| 10 | Cross-Examination By Mr. Miley Examination By Commissioner | 663 666 |
| 11 | Rechtschaffen Examination By ALJ Cooke | 671 |
| 12 | Redirect Examination By Mr. Weissmann | 674 |
| 13 | Recross-Examination By Mr. Geesman | 681 |
| 14 | Recross-Examination By Mr. Abrams | 682 |
| 15 | NORA MEAD BROWNELL | |
| 16 | Direct Examination By Mr. Weissmann | 684 |
| 17 | Cross-Examination By Ms. Sheriff Cross-Examination By Ms. Kelly | 687 692 |
| 18 | Cross-Examination By Mr. Geesman Cross-Examination By Mr. Long | 696 704 |
| 19 | Cross-Examination By Mr. Strauss Cross-Examination By Mr. Abrams | 724 738 |
| 20 | Examination By Commissioner Rechtschaffen | 775 |
| 21 | Redirect Examination By Mr. Weissmann | 783 |
| 22 | Recross-Examination By Mr. Strauss | 785 |
| 23 | JESSICA HOGLE | |
| 24 | Direct Examination By Ms. Dippo Cross-Examination By Mr. Strauss | 787 788 |
| 25 | _ | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |

```
1
 2
     Exhibits:
                            Iden. Evid.
 3
     ABRAMS-X-09
                               517
     TURN-X-05
                              517
 4
     TURN-X-06
                              518
     CAL ADVOCATES-X-01
                              518
     CAL ADVOCATES-X-02
                              518
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

| SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA |
|---|
| FEBRUARY 28, 2020 - 8:35 AM |
| * * * * |
| ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE COOKE: Let's |
| be on the record. |
| JASON WELLS, |
| resumed the stand and testified further as |
| follows: |
| ALJ COOKE: This is the time and place |
| for further evidentiary hearing in |
| Investigation 19-09-016. I am Assistant |
| Chief Administrative Law Judge Michelle |
| Cooke. I will be covering today's hearing |
| for Administrative Law Judge Peter Allen, who |
| is the assigned administrative law judge. |
| When we left off yesterday we had |
| just sworn in Mr. Wells, and Mr. Weissmann |
| has some clarifications to add to the items |
| that he is sponsoring today. |
| Mr. Weissmann. |
| MR. WEISSMANN: Thank you, your Honor. |
| DIRECT EXAMINATION RESUMED |
| BY MR. WEISSMANN: |
| Q Good morning, Mr. Wells. Are you |
| sponsoring what has been marked for |
| identification as PG&E-2, which contains |
| exhibits to your testimony? |
| A I am. |
| |

| Q Are you also sponsoring what has |
|--|
| been marked for identification as PG&E-3 |
| containing additional exhibits to your |
| testimony? |
| A I am. |
| Q Are you also examining within what |
| has been marked for identification as PG&E-4, |
| Exhibits 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9? |
| A Yes, I am. |
| MR. WEISSMANN: Thank you. The witness |
| is available for cross-examination. |
| ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| Before we turn to cross-examination, |
| I'm going to identify a few exhibits that may |
| be coming up today. At this time I will mark |
| for identification as Exhibit Abrams-X-9, a |
| cross-examination exhibit titled Better Way |
| Out of PG&E bankruptcy. |
| (Exhibit No. ABRAMS-X-09 was marked for identification.) |
| for identification.) |
| ALJ COOKE: At this time I will mark |
| for identification as Exhibit TURN-X-5 a TURN |
| Cross-Examination Exhibit, PG&E Response to |
| TURN DR-5, Question 5. |
| (Exhibit No. TURN-X-05 was marked for identification.) |
| TOT IUCIICITICACIOII./ |
| ALJ COOKE: At this time I will mark |
| for identification as Exhibit TURN-X-6 TURN |
| |

| 1 | Cross-Examination Exhibit, which is excerpts |
|----|---|
| 2 | from an EPUC data response and PG&E responses |
| 3 | to TURN DR Set 7. |
| 4 | (Exhibit No. TURN-X-06 was marked for identification.) |
| 5 | for identification.) |
| 6 | ALJ COOKE: At this time I will mark |
| 7 | for identification as Cal Advocates-X-1 |
| 8 | PG&E's Public Responses to the Public |
| 9 | Advocates Office's Data Request No. 001 |
| 10 | through No. 006, dated February 2020. |
| 11 | (Exhibit No. CAL ADVOCATES-X-01 was marked for identification.) |
| 12 | marked for identification.) |
| 13 | ALJ COOKE: At this time I will mark |
| 14 | for identification as Cal Advocates-X-2, |
| 15 | Excerpts from PG&E 2019 Form 10-K. The cover |
| 16 | page is dated February 20th, 2020. |
| 17 | (Exhibit No. CAL ADVOCATES-X-02 was marked for identification.) |
| 18 | |
| 19 | ALJ COOKE: At this time we will turn |
| 20 | to cross-examination by MCE, Ms. Kelly. |
| 21 | MS. KELLY: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 22 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 23 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 24 | Q Thank you, Mr. Wells. |
| 25 | A Good morning. |
| 26 | Q So in your testimony you state that |
| 27 | PG&E will pursue a securitization, a |
| 28 | |

| 1 | on average for the wildfire for the |
|----------|---|
| 2 | \$7 billion in wildfire claim costs; is that |
| 3 | correct? |
| 4 | A That is correct. |
| 5 | Q You propose to basically securitize |
| 6 | ratepayer revenues under that transaction; is |
| 7 | that correct? |
| 8 | A That is correct. |
| 9 | Q Great. |
| 10 | Now, if you could please turn to |
| 11 | Exhibit MCE-X-1 page 54. Let me know when |
| 12 | you are there. |
| 13 | A Okay. |
| 14 | Q So for the benefit of the folks in |
| 15 | the room here, this is the motion of the |
| 16 | debtors regarding customer programs and |
| 17 | public purpose programs dated March 12th, |
| 18 | 2019. |
| 19 | You are familiar with this |
| 20 | document? |
| 21 | A Yes, I am. |
| 22 | Q Thank you. |
| 23 | So starting on page 54 PG&E |
| 24 | describes funds received by PG&E that flow to |
| 25 | what is being broadly called "customer |
| | |
| 26 | programs;" is that correct? |
| 26 27 | programs;" is that correct? A That is correct, yeah. |

can correct me if I'm wrong. Those customer 1 2 programs are: deposit and reimbursement 3 programs, public purpose programs, environmental cleanup programs, third-party 4 5 programs, GHG credit programs, and customer 6 support programs; correct? That is correct. 7 Α And community choice aggregator, or 8 0 9 CCA funds, are part of what is called 10 third-party programs; correct? 11 Α If I can take just a minute. Let's be off the record. 12 ALJ COOKE: (Off the record.) 13 14 ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. 15 THE WITNESS: I would not characterize 16 the community choice aggregation as 17 customer-related programs, no. 18 BY MS. KELLY: 19 Please turn to page -- please turn 2.0 to page 69 of that same document, which 21 defines third-party programs. 22 I see the reference. You are Α 23 right. 24 So third-party programs includes Q 25 CCA funds? 26 Α That is correct. 27 Okay. So speaking about customer 0 programs broadly, the list of six items that 2.8

| 1 | we went through just now, does PG&E propose |
|----|--|
| 2 | to pledge or incumber or securitize any of |
| 3 | the funds associated with these customer |
| 4 | programs? |
| 5 | A No. We would not anticipate |
| 6 | securitizing or recovering these revenues |
| 7 | associated with these programs. |
| 8 | Q Is that shown in your testimony |
| 9 | anywhere? |
| 10 | A No. The testimony that I sponsored |
| 11 | does not address the specifics of the |
| 12 | securitization transaction that we intend to |
| 13 | file in a separate application. So no, it is |
| 14 | not addressed specifically. |
| 15 | Q Thank you. |
| 16 | So turning to Exhibit PG&E-12 Slide |
| 17 | 29. |
| 18 | A Yes, I am there. |
| 19 | Q So this comes from PG&E's business |
| 20 | outlook February 2020. And so in this |
| 21 | chart what does this chart show? |
| 22 | A This chart is highlighting the rate |
| 23 | base growth that the company has forecasted |
| 24 | under its five-year financial projections. |
| 25 | Q So this is for the forecast? You |
| 26 | are saying that it would be a year-over-year |
| 27 | increase of 8 percent or is that 8 percent |
| 28 | over the entire period? |

| 1 | A It is a compounded annual growth |
|----|---|
| 2 | rate. So year, annually, on average rate |
| 3 | base will go 8 percent. |
| 4 | Q So subject to check, you expect |
| 5 | your rate base to grow during the period of |
| 6 | 2019 to 2024 by 47 percent? |
| 7 | A Subject to check, but it sounds |
| 8 | directionally accurate. |
| 9 | Q So we were just talking about |
| 10 | customer programs. Are what is defined as |
| 11 | customer program funds included in this rate |
| 12 | base figure? |
| 13 | A This rate base figure doesn't take |
| 14 | into consideration customer-related programs. |
| 15 | Rate base is essentially I characterize it |
| 16 | as a cumulative investment in our gas and |
| 17 | electric systems. So it is actual cost to |
| 18 | deliver electricity and gas to customers less |
| 19 | the depreciation in taxes. |
| 20 | ALJ COOKE: May I interrupt for just a |
| 21 | moment? Ms. Kelly, can you direct me to |
| 22 | where it is that you are what document you |
| 23 | are looking at again? |
| 24 | MS. KELLY: Yes. I am happy to do |
| 25 | that, your Honor. This is PG&E Hearing Room |
| 26 | Exhibit 12, Slide 29. |
| 27 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 28 | BY MS. KELLY: |

| 1 | Q Now, turn back to your testimony, |
|----|---|
| 2 | let's go to page 2-1. |
| 3 | ALJ COOKE: This is in PG&E-1? |
| 4 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 5 | Q Yes, I'm sorry. Exhibit PG&E-1 |
| 6 | page 2-1. |
| 7 | A Okay. I'm there. |
| 8 | Q Okay. So if you could please read |
| 9 | the last bullet in your list on that page. |
| 10 | A "Position the utility and PG&E |
| 11 | Corporation will be financially healthy upon |
| 12 | emergence. That one? |
| 13 | Q Yeah. So you are saying that a |
| 14 | plan of reorganization will position the |
| 15 | utility and PG&E Corporation to be |
| 16 | financially healthy upon emergence. |
| 17 | Okay. So what is an average |
| 18 | secured debt credit rating of an |
| 19 | investor-owned utility in the United States? |
| 20 | A I don't have the figures in front |
| 21 | of me, but I would anticipate the high |
| 22 | investment grade ratings BBB+, A-, using S&P. |
| 23 | Q Using S&P. You were saying the |
| 24 | BBB+ or A-? |
| 25 | A Subject to verification. But |
| 26 | generally speaking, yes. |
| 27 | Q Yeah. Thank you. |
| 28 | And what would be an average |

| 1 | unsecured debt rating of an investor-owned |
|----|--|
| 2 | utility in the United States? |
| 3 | A I'm sorry. Can you repeat the |
| 4 | question? |
| 5 | Q Yes. What would be an average |
| 6 | unsecured debt rating of an investor-owned |
| 7 | utility in the United States? |
| 8 | A I think most are trading probably |
| 9 | around BBB+ or better. |
| 10 | Q Okay. So that would be a |
| 11 | reasonable investor-owned utility credit |
| 12 | grade rating? |
| 13 | A I object to the term "reasonable." |
| 14 | But I would say that, yes, |
| 15 | generally speaking that is where utility |
| 16 | investment grade ratings are currently set. |
| 17 | Q Okay. Great. |
| 18 | And then, so you had said it |
| 19 | positions the utility to be financially |
| 20 | healthy. Can you clarify that? Are you |
| 21 | saying that immediately after emergence from |
| 22 | Chapter 11 the utility and PG&E Corporation |
| 23 | will be financially healthy? |
| 24 | A I believe that is the case, yes. |
| 25 | Q So earlier this week Mr. Plaster |
| 26 | testified that the secured credit rating of |
| 27 | the utility would be about BBB or BBB Is |
| 28 | that indicative of a financially healthy |

| 1 | company? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. WEISSMANN: I'm sorry. Can you |
| 3 | repeat the question, please? |
| 4 | MS. KELLY: Yes. |
| 5 | Q Earlier this week Mr. Plaster |
| 6 | testified that the secured credit rating of |
| 7 | the utilities would be about BBB or BBB Is |
| 8 | that indicative of a financially healthy |
| 9 | company? |
| 10 | MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Misstates |
| 11 | Mr. Plaster's testimony. |
| 12 | MS. KELLY: Would you like to correct |
| 13 | what Mr. Plaster stated? |
| 14 | MR. WEISSMANN: Yes. He was talking |
| 15 | about unsecured. |
| 16 | MS. KELLY: Mr. Plaster testified to |
| 17 | both secured and unsecured? |
| 18 | MR. WEISSMANN: He did. He said |
| 19 | secured would be investment grade. |
| 20 | MS. KELLY: Yes; correct. The secured |
| 21 | credit rating of the utility would be about |
| 22 | BBB or BBB-, which is an investment grade |
| 23 | rating. |
| 24 | MR. WEISSMANN: That is incorrect. But |
| 25 | why don't we let the witness answer. |
| 26 | ALJ COOKE: Let's let the witness |
| 27 | answer. And people can review the transcript |
| 28 | to determine what Mr. Plaster said earlier. |

| 1 | THE WITNESS: Yes. I do think it is |
|----|---|
| 2 | reflective of a financially healthy utility. |
| 3 | I think what is important to unpack here that |
| 4 | ratings are driven by two things. They are |
| 5 | driven by quantitative |
| 6 | MS. KELLY: Objection, your Honor. May |
| 7 | we please get to the line of questioning? |
| 8 | Unfortunately, I only have 30 minutes. |
| 9 | ALJ COOKE: Let's answer the question |
| 10 | that the attorney asked. And if your |
| 11 | attorney would like to have clarification on |
| 12 | redirect, that is okay. |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. |
| 14 | MS. KELLY: Thank you very much. |
| 15 | ALJ COOKE: Let's approach it that way |
| 16 | as much as possible today for everybody. |
| 17 | MS. KELLY: Thank you. |
| 18 | Q Mr. Plaster testified, getting back |
| 19 | to this, that the secured credit rating would |
| 20 | be BBB or BBB Is that are those |
| 21 | investment grade ratings? |
| 22 | A Yes, they are. |
| 23 | Q And are the secured credit ratings |
| 24 | of BBB or BBB- indicative of a financially |
| 25 | healthy investor-owned utility? |
| 26 | A Yes, they are. |
| 27 | Q Yesterday Mr. Plaster testified |
| 28 | that the unsecured credit rating of the |

| 1 | utility would be non-investment grade; is |
|----|--|
| 2 | that correct? |
| 3 | A That is likely, yes. |
| 4 | Q Having an unsecured credit rating, |
| 5 | is that indicative of a financially healthy |
| 6 | company? |
| 7 | A Quantitatively, we have targeted |
| 8 | financial metrics that are consistent with |
| 9 | the financially healthy utility. That rating |
| LO | that you are referring to is more of a |
| L1 | reflection of the qualitative business risk |
| L2 | assessment of the California environment. |
| L3 | Q So let's just use an abstract |
| L4 | utility with an unsecured credit rating of, |
| L5 | say, BB, which I believe was one of the |
| L6 | potential unsecured debt ratings of the |
| L7 | company. So that is considered |
| L8 | non-investment grade speculative; correct? |
| L9 | A That is correct. |
| 20 | Q So would a utility with a BB |
| 21 | unsecured credit rating, would you consider |
| 22 | that to be a financially healthy company? |
| 23 | A I could, depending on the financial |
| 24 | metrics. |
| 25 | Q Okay. And credit metrics are not |
| 26 | the same as a credit rating; correct? |
| 27 | A That is correct. |
| 28 | Q When would PG&E expect to have an |

investment grade credit rating for unsecured 1 2 debt? It is hard to speculate exactly 3 А when the credit rating agencies would raise 4 5 the company's rating, because the driver of the rating that you are referring to is more 6 of an assessment of the business risk 7 environment here in California, as opposed to the financial plan that we put forward. 10 And in your best professional Q 11 judgment, based on your knowledge as the CFO 12 of a publicly traded company, and just knowing the market, what do you think in your 13 14 professional judgment would be the timing for 15 PG&E to have an investment grade credit 16 rating for unsecured debt? 17 I'm trying to be responsive. 18 believe we put forward a plan that, based on 19 the credit --2.0 MS. KELLY: Yes. Objection, your 21 Honor. Nonresponsive. 22 ALJ COOKE: I'm going to allow him to 2.3 answer. THE WITNESS: We put forward a plan 24 25 that I believe meets the definition of investment grade from a financial profile. 26 27 Another party's assessment of the California business environment is difficult for me to 2.8

speculate as to when they will have 1 2. confidence to upgrade the overall rating to 3 investment grade. BY MS. KELLY: 4 When would PG&E seek to receive an 5 6 investment grade -- seek to receive an 7 investment grade credit rating for unsecured debt? 8 9 Α As quickly as possible. 10 0 But as testified yesterday, 11 currently, my apologies, the other day, Mr. 12 Plaster said that at this point those would 13 be non-investment grade; correct? 14 That is correct. Α 15 0 Thank you. 16 So next I want to turn to just some 17 questions about what PG&E is saying in its 18 testimony and what it is asking for. So MCE 19 had requested that the sources and uses of 2.0 PG&E be broken out by -- into the utility's 21 sources and uses and the corporation's 22 sources and uses; is that correct? 2.3 Α I think that is correct. Yes. 24 O Did you provide that? 25 Α I'm not aware of us providing that 26 yet. 27 Subject to check, would you say 0 2.8 that in your data request response you stated

that that was, quote, "highly confidential"? 1 2. Α Subject to check, yes. And in the bankruptcy context are 3 0 the finances of the utilities and the 4 corporation highly confidential? 5 As a publicly traded company, much 6 7 of the details of financial rejections are highly confidential. 9 Q In the bankruptcy context? 10 Δ Yes. 11 Q Would you please turn to page --12 actually, given that we are short on time, I will pass on that question. But I'll refer 13 14 to that -- to the bankruptcy filing and 15 financials that, for example, are given to 16 the bankruptcy court on a regular basis. 17 That is set forth in MCE-X-1 beginning on 18 page 25. 19 And have you provided to the 2.0 Commission a breakdown of sources and uses 21 between the company and the corporation? 22 I'm not aware of doing that yet. Α 2.3 And MCE had also requested for a 0 visual representation, such as a cash flow 24 25 diagram of this transaction. Does PG&E have 26 such a diagram? 27 Can you specify which transaction? Α How about the transactions 2.8 Yes. Q

| that close immediately in order to emerge |
|---|
| from bankruptcy, those transactions. |
| A It is reflected in the second page |
| of my testimony. |
| Q What I'm discussing is a visual |
| representation, a visual map, not just a list |
| of sources and uses. |
| A No. We don't have a visual map. |
| We identify the party, where the funding is |
| coming from and where that funding is going. |
| Q Okay. Now I would like to clarify |
| what PG&E is actually saying in its testimony |
| and what it is asking of the Commission. So |
| you asked for four financing authorizations; |
| correct? |
| A That is correct. |
| Q And you also have those tables set |
| forth on the Tables 2.2 to 2.4; is that |
| correct? |
| A I believe that is correct. Yes. |
| Q For Table 2.2 |
| ALJ COOKE: Can you direct us to a |
| page? |
| BY MS. KELLY: |
| Q Yes. At 2-16 of your testimony. |
| A I'm there. |
| 0 51 1 |
| Q Thank you. |
| |

date of sources that you are contemplating 1 2 What is the date? As of what date there? 3 are you contemplating there? We haven't specified a specific 4 That will be dependent upon the 5 date. 6 receipt of the confirmation order and 7 effectuating the exit stage of financing, and ultimately emergence from bankruptcy. We are 8 9 anticipating roughly the middle of the 10 summer. 11 0 Okay. And so this is the immediate 12 exit from bankruptcy? That is correct. 13 Α And in Table 2.3, those used are 14 0 15 upon the immediate exit; is that correct? 16 Α That is correct. 17 And Table 2.4, what is that date? 0 18 Α That would be immediately upon exit 19 as well. 2.0 So the items set forth in 2.4 are 21 contained within Table 2. -- can you explain 22 where those fit? 2.3 They would reconcile to 2.2, the Α 24 sources. So the line in Table 2.2, new 25 utility debt of 23.775 billion reconciles. 26 This is an expansion of that detail under 27 2.4. 2.8 Q Thank you.

| 1 | So getting into the more specifics |
|----|---|
| 2 | of things. So the 11 I'm just going to go |
| 3 | one, two, three, four with your financing |
| 4 | request. Is that okay? |
| 5 | A Sure. |
| 6 | Q Okay. So your first request is for |
| 7 | 11.85 billion in long-term debt? |
| 8 | A That is correct. |
| 9 | Q And that is also immediately upon |
| 10 | exit? |
| 11 | A That is correct. |
| 12 | Q Okay. And is there a shorthand |
| 13 | that is used more globally for that debt? |
| 14 | So, for example, a long-term noteholder RSA |
| 15 | debt, or some other defined term that is used |
| 16 | consistently throughout your financials, in |
| 17 | bankruptcy plan and your testimony? |
| 18 | A If I could have one minute to flip. |
| 19 | It is defined in my testimony a little bit |
| 20 | later. |
| 21 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 22 | (Off the record.) |
| 23 | ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: Page 2-27, at the bottom |
| 25 | of the page there starts a description of the |
| 26 | 11.85 billion of long-term debt secured as |
| 27 | contemplated by the noteholder RSA. It then, |
| 28 | over the next I'll call it page and a |

quarter, page and a third, breaks down those 1 2. specific insurance. MS. KELLY: So this is reflected on 3 Exhibit 2.7; is that correct? No. 4 Exhibit 2.7, Volume 4, PG&E-4. 5 ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. 6 7 (Off the record.) ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the 8 9 record. 10 I think what we are doing is doing 11 nomenclature reconciliation across different 12 volumes of the testimony? And the plan, your Honor. 13 MS. KELLY: 14 ALJ COOKE: And the plan. BY MS. KELLY: 15 16 Okay. So let's starts from the 17 beginning. Thank you. 18 So you are requesting 11 -- the 19 first request is 11.85 billion in long-term 2.0 Where is that -- where are the term debt. 21 sheets for this? My apologies. Let me go 22 back to my original question. Is this the same debt as reflected 2.3 2.4 in Exhibit 2.7? 25 And 2.6. А 26 So you have to look at 2.6 and 2.7 27 combined in order to reach this figure? Α 28 That's correct. And a summary of

that can be found basically on page 228 of my 1 2. testimony. So the -- and so it isn't 3 Q Okay. exactly long-term debt. It's a split of 4 5 medium-term debt and long-term debt; is that 6 correct? 7 Α Technically it's long term because it's greater than a year, but the maturities 8 9 do differ, so we characterize them as medium 10 term for essentially five-and-eight-year 11 notes and the longer-term notes. 12 And what are the mandatory uses of that debt on your tables, Table 2.3? 13 14 Α It addresses the line item on 2 15 point -- Table 2.3 that is entitled 16 Pre-Petition Debt, 22.18 billion. 17 Let me just take a quick pause 18 So these notes that you're talking 19 about are notes of the utility, correct? 2.0 Α That is correct, yes. 21 And that is paying off items that 22 include holding company debt? 2.3 Α May I explain in a longer answer? 24 O Yeah. Let's turn to page 2-10 of 25 your testimony, PG&E-1. And I would 26 appreciate a short answer. And then if the 27 short answer doesn't answer it, then we can 2.8 talk about the longer answer.

The short answer is it doesn't 1 Α 2. relate to the items identified on page 2-10 of my testimony. It relates to Table 2.3 3 that pre-petition debt which I can break down 4 5 for you. 6 0 I am sorry. I couldn't follow 7 that. Can you say that again? It might be easier if I had the 8 9 opportunity to --10 Yeah, please. Q 11 Α When we entered bankruptcy, we had 12 22.18 billion of debt at the utility. is entitled Pre-Petition Debt under Table 13 14 2.3. Some of that debt was high-coupon debt that we negotiated with noteholders to 15 16 exchange into new lower-cost notes that are 17 outlined later in my testimony. That's that 18 11.825 billion if you look on Table 2.2. 19 Just above that line on Table 2.2, 2.0 there's a Reinstatement of Utility Debt. 21 that 9.575 billion were the low-coupon bonds 22 that we thought were in customers' interest 2.3 to reinstate. 24 If you add the 9.575 billion and 25 11.85, it's essentially addressing the 26 pre-petition debt of the utility in that 27 manner. 2.8 Okay. Would you please turn to Q

page 2-10 of your testimony? 1 2 I am there. Α So, one of the items that is 3 0 identified as Pre-Petition Debt is Utility PC 4 Bond Claims and Hold Co-Funded Debt Claims. 5 What are the Hold Co-Funded Debt Claims? 6 7 Α Prior to entering bankruptcy, we had a term loan at the holding company. 9 we had draw on the corporate revolver. 10 had two borrowings at the holding company. 11 So is -- turning back to Table 2.3, 12 is that included in the pre-petition debt 13 line item? 14 MR. WEISSMANN: Can you just repeat 15 your question please? 16 BY MS. KELLY: 17 What I am trying to 0 Yes. 18 understand just more generally there is a 19 long-term debt that is going to be -- planned 2.0 to be taken out by the utility. So this is this 11.85 billion. It is going to be used 21 22 for pre-petition debt and that pre-petition 2.3 debt includes debt of PG&E Corporation. 24 So I am trying to understand that. 25 MR. WEISSMANN: That misstates his 26 testimony, but you can answer. 27 THE WITNESS: Included in 22.18 billion is the funded debt of the holding company 2.8

which is approximately 650 million. 1 2 BY MS. KELLY: And are there any other amounts of 3 pre-petition debt that are at the corporation 4 level? 5 6 Α No. 7 0 And so is that 650 million going to be paid for directly or indirectly by the 8 11.5 billion in long-term debt? 9 10 Δ No. 11 0 So, your next request is 11.925 12 billion in what you call additional long-term debt. Where is that reflected on these 13 14 tables? 15 On Table 2.2. There is new debt of Δ 16 5.825 billion and then temporary utility debt 17 of 6 billion. And then -- apologies -- above 18 those two lines there's a refinancing of 19 pollution control bonds for 0.1 million. 2.0 ALJ COOKE: So, time check here, about 21 a half hour. 22 MS. KELLY: Okay. Thank you. I hope 2.3 to be done. This is taking longer than I'd 24 expected, your Honor. Okay. May we go off 25 the record for a moment? ALJ COOKE: Off the record. 26 27 (Off the record.) 2.8 ALJ COOKE: Back on the record.

| 1 | Ms. Kelly. |
|-----|--|
| 2 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 3 | Q Thank you, your Honor. Okay. So |
| 4 | and then where are the in your exhibits, |
| 5 | where are the term sheets for those? Or |
| 6 | where are those documents referenced in your |
| 7 | exhibits? |
| 8 | MR. WEISSMANN: Could you clarify what |
| 9 | documents you're referring to, counsel? |
| LO | BY MS. KELLY: |
| L1 | Q The 11.925 billion in additional |
| L2 | long-term debt. |
| L3 | A I don't believe they were |
| L4 | referenced in the exhibits because they are |
| L5 | the debt that we need to issue upon exit. So |
| L6 | we are looking for authorization here to do |
| L 7 | so. |
| L8 | Q So there are no term sheets or |
| L9 | commitment letters for that? |
| 20 | A The 5.825 billion is part of the |
| 21 | bridge commitment letter in Exhibit 2.8. |
| 22 | Q And the remainder does not have any |
| 23 | commitment letter or term sheet? |
| 24 | A Correct. We have not negotiated |
| 25 | one currently. |
| 26 | Q And you're attempting for the |
| 27 | Commission to authorize this transaction |
| 28 | without the terms and conditions of those |

| 1 | debts? |
|----|---|
| 2 | A We are asking for authorization to |
| 3 | issue 6 billion of debt at the utility but |
| 4 | that debt would be paid for by shareholders. |
| 5 | Q But it would be taken out at the |
| 6 | utility level? |
| 7 | A That's correct. |
| 8 | ALJ COOKE: Let me ask a question. |
| 9 | Mr. Wells, are you aware of when the |
| 10 | Commission reviews applications to grant |
| 11 | utilities authority to issue debt of whether |
| 12 | those applications include terms and |
| 13 | conditions related to that authority to issue |
| 14 | debt? |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I am generally |
| 16 | aware, yeah, yeah. |
| 17 | ALJ COOKE: And are you aware of |
| 18 | whether those applications typically do |
| 19 | include those terms and conditions or do not? |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: I'm not aware. |
| 21 | ALJ COOKE: You're not aware of whether |
| 22 | they what they include? |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: What they typically |
| 24 | include, yes. |
| 25 | ALJ COOKE: Okay. Thank you. |
| 26 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 27 | Q Okay. So we have the bridge |
| | |

| 1 | which I do want to come back to, and some |
|----|--|
| 2 | other needs that do not have commitment |
| 3 | letters or term sheets. Okay. |
| 4 | Now turning on to Item 3, this 6 |
| 5 | billion dollars in short-term debt, where is |
| 6 | that reflected in the sources and uses |
| 7 | rather sources? My apologies. |
| 8 | A That third authorization is not |
| 9 | directly reflected in sources. It's |
| 10 | authorization for ongoing short-term |
| 11 | borrowing. |
| 12 | Q And that would be executed |
| 13 | immediately upon exit? |
| 14 | A It would be a variety of |
| 15 | instruments that we've outlined later in my |
| 16 | testimony. |
| 17 | Q And each of those instruments are |
| 18 | expected to be entered into immediately upon |
| 19 | emergence? |
| 20 | A Not necessarily. Some of them may, |
| 21 | but not all of them. |
| 22 | Q And where are the term sheets and |
| 23 | commitment letters for those transactions? |
| 24 | A We have not finalized the |
| 25 | negotiations. |
| 26 | Q Okay. Next item, Item 4. |
| 27 | 11.925 billion in short-term debt |
| 28 | to temporarily finance PG&E's exit from |

```
1
     bankruptcy?
 2.
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Ms. Kelly, can you direct
     me to where that number is?
 3
           MS. KELLY: Yeah. That is Item 4.
 4
 5
               And I apologize. I will speak into
 6
     the microphone.
 7
               Item 4 on page 2-3 of Exhibit
     PG&E-1, the main part of PG&E's testimony.
 8
 9
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Thank you.
10
           MS. KELLY:
                       Thanks.
11
           ALJ COOKE:
                       So that is showing on
     line 21 of 2-3?
12
                      Line 25 of two dash -- 26
13
           MS. KELLY:
14
     -- my apologies, 2-3.
15
           ALJ COOKE:
                      Okay.
16
     BY MS. KELLY:
17
               Okay. So, where does that 11.925
           0
18
     billion show up in the sources and uses?
19
               It's essentially the short-term
2.0
     financing of the three line items that I
21
     mentioned that we need, new utility debt that
22
     would be refinancing of pollution control 0.1
2.3
     billion, new debt 5.825 billion and temporary
24
     utility debt 6 billion.
25
               So you're actually talking about
26
     when you had said that -- when you identified
27
     the items of what I am going to call Request
2.8
     Number 2, same amount 11.925 billion, that is
```

-- can you explain the relationship between 1 2. Request Number 2 and Request Number 4? They're similar. 3 Α Request 4 authorizes the short-term nature, to the 4 extent that we have to issue the securities 5 under the bridge commitment that is 6 7 referenced in Exhibit 2.8 and to the extent that we issue short-term temporary utility 8 debt. 9 10 The purpose would be that 11 ultimately that should be long-term debt that 12 will be refinanced into the long-term notes 13 that are referenced in Authorization Number 14 2. 15 So what you're saying is anything 16 that you are not able to finance under the 11.925 billion would be in essence shifted to 17 18 this short-term financing; is that correct? 19 Not necessarily. I would look at 2.0 it as somewhat of an insurance policy to make 21 sure that we would have exit financing on a 22 short-term basis for the exit, which we would 2.3 ultimately defer into long-term financing. 24 ALJ COOKE: Can I ask a clarifying 25 question here? 26 On page 2.3, you have the item at 27 That's the same figure 11.925 2.8 billion in long-term financing and then in

| 1 | Number 4 which shows on the same 11.925 |
|--|--|
| 2 | billion, on line 26 of page 2.3 of Exhibit |
| 3 | PG&E-1. That's the same new utility debt |
| 4 | that you're referring to. It's just at |
| 5 | different points in time it might be short |
| 6 | term versus long term. It's not twice? |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: It's not intended to be |
| 8 | duplicative, your Honor. It's to the extent |
| 9 | that for whatever reason we can't access the |
| 10 | capital markets at exit, the bankruptcy |
| 11 | committed to fund on a short-term basis a |
| 12 | bridge loan, which would ultimately be taken |
| 13 | out with-long term debt. And so we wouldn't |
| 14 | intend to have at the same time the same |
| 15 | amount issued twice. |
| 16 | It's just effectively the same |
| 10 | |
| 17 | amount in case we have challenges raising the |
| | _ |
| 17 | amount in case we have challenges raising the |
| 17 18 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. |
| 17 18 19 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the |
| 17 18 19 20 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the authority to do it at the full amount at |
| 17 18 19 20 21 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the authority to do it at the full amount at either level because over time that need will |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the authority to do it at the full amount at either level because over time that need will change? |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the authority to do it at the full amount at either level because over time that need will change? THE WITNESS: That's correct. |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the authority to do it at the full amount at either level because over time that need will change? THE WITNESS: That's correct. ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | amount in case we have challenges raising the money. ALJ COOKE: But you're seeking the authority to do it at the full amount at either level because over time that need will change? THE WITNESS: That's correct. ALJ COOKE: Thank you. BY MS. KELLY: |

```
-- Item 4 of 11.925 billion?
 1
 2.
           Α
               That's correct.
               Thank you. Now I would like to
 3
           Q
     turn to your utility bridge loan,
 4
     Exhibit 2.8?
 5
           ALJ COOKE: And Exhibit 2.8 is in
 6
 7
     PG&E-2?
           MS. KELLY: 2.8 is in PG&E --
 9
           ALJ COOKE: PG&E-4?
10
           MS. KELLY: -- 7.
11
           ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record.
                (Off the record.)
12
           ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the
13
14
     record.
15
               To clarify where we are, we're in
16
     Exhibit PG&E-7, page 2-EXH.2.8-1.
                                         And
17
     although this document is entitled Personal
18
     and Confidential, in it, it is not
19
     confidential any longer.
2.0
     BY MS. KELLY:
21
           0
               Thank you. I am actually, due to
22
     the limited number of minutes I have in
2.3
     cross-examination, please just hold that
24
     place for just a second so I can ask a quick
25
     but important question on another item.
26
               In the main portion of PG&E's
27
     testimony, in your testimony, page 2-21 --
28
           Α
               Yes.
```

| 1 | Q please look at Footnote 47. |
|----|--|
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q Where is the complete list of |
| 4 | waivers that PG&E is requesting of the |
| 5 | Commission in connection with this plan? |
| 6 | A I believe we clarified that. We |
| 7 | began to outline it on page 2-22 of the |
| 8 | testimony and then clarified that. I forget |
| 9 | the official title of the document, but with |
| 10 | testimony this week. I can walk through the |
| 11 | three adjustments that we're seeking if that |
| 12 | would be helpful. |
| 13 | ALJ COOKE: Let's have a statement from |
| 14 | counsel after lunch of what that |
| 15 | clarification was that was done in the |
| 16 | earlier testimony. |
| 17 | MS. KELLY: That would be great. Thank |
| 18 | you, your Honor. |
| 19 | Q And just to clarify, in the |
| 20 | footnote, this includes I'm sorry. I just |
| 21 | want to make sure I am close to the |
| 22 | microphone here. Ratemaking capital, holding |
| 23 | company conditions and Affiliate Transaction |
| 24 | Rules; is that correct? |
| 25 | A That's correct. |
| 26 | Q And it says, "including in |
| 27 | connection with any dividends." Could you |
| 28 | explain that please? |

| 1 | A Part of the company needs to |
|----|---|
| 2 | satisfy its capital structure requirements in |
| 3 | order to declare a dividend. So we're |
| 4 | suggesting here the adjustments would be part |
| 5 | of the calculation to become in compliance |
| 6 | with this capital structure. |
| 7 | Q And so are you referring here to |
| 8 | the Commission's requirement on the first |
| 9 | priority condition of the holding company? |
| 10 | A I'm not familiar with that |
| 11 | condition. |
| 12 | Q So you have not made a showing in |
| 13 | your testimony that PG&E is in compliance |
| 14 | under these transactions with the first |
| 15 | priority condition? |
| 16 | A What I intended to do with this |
| 17 | testimony is reflect the adjustments |
| 18 | MS. KELLY: Objection. Nonresponsive. |
| 19 | Q Have you demonstrated in your |
| 20 | testimony that PG&E has met a first-priority |
| 21 | condition? |
| 22 | MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Calls for a |
| 23 | legal conclusion. |
| 24 | ALJ COOKE: The witness can answer to |
| 25 | the best of his ability. |
| 26 | THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. |
| 27 | BY MS KELLY: |
| 28 | Q Thank you. Turning back to the |

| 1 | commitment letter? |
|----|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Two minutes. |
| 3 | MS. KELLY: Thank you, your Honor. I |
| 4 | will make this as quick as possible. |
| 5 | Q Okay. So, this the term sheet |
| 6 | refers also to a sort of sister financing, |
| 7 | let's call it, of the or parallel |
| 8 | financing, let's call it, of PG&E |
| 9 | Corporation; is that correct? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q And those these two documents |
| 12 | are very interrelated; is that correct? |
| 13 | A Only insofar as it's the same banks |
| 14 | providing the commitment. |
| 15 | Q Okay. So let's start with what is |
| 16 | being secured under this note. So this is |
| 17 | this note, what you call what again, the |
| 18 | bridge facility? |
| 19 | A The bridge commitment letter. |
| 20 | Q Bridge commitment letter is a |
| 21 | first-priority security interest in |
| 22 | substantially all of the present and after- |
| 23 | acquired assets of the borrower. That's the |
| 24 | utility, correct? |
| 25 | A That's correct. |
| 26 | Q Okay. Now, if you could turn to |
| 27 | mandatory prepayments and commitment |
| 28 | reductions starting at page 26. |

| 1 | A I don't have a page 26. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q Oh, sorry. This is on MCE I'm |
| 3 | sorry. This is in |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 5 | (Off the record.) |
| 6 | ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. |
| 7 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 8 | Q Okay. So, in these mandatory |
| 9 | prepayments, it states here on page 27, |
| 10 | middle of the second main paragraph, the |
| 11 | borrower may not prepay loans or reduce |
| 12 | commitments under the facility, that's this |
| 13 | facility, without prepaying or reducing the |
| 14 | PG&E facility on a pro rata basis. Do you |
| 15 | see where that is? |
| 16 | A Yes, I see that. |
| 17 | Q Okay. So, in essence any payments |
| 18 | under this facility, you have to pro rata pay |
| 19 | down the same amount in the corporation case |
| 20 | facility? |
| 21 | A I would need time to read this to |
| 22 | |
| 23 | Q Who would be the correct witness to |
| 24 | ask about the terms and conditions of these 6 |
| 25 | billion dollar finances? I mean that would |
| 26 | be you as the Chief Financial Officer; is |
| 27 | that correct? |
| 28 | A That's correct. I just need a |
| | 1 |

| 1 | minute to read the document. |
|----|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 3 | (Off the record.) |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 5 | record. |
| 6 | Mr. Wells has reviewed it. |
| 7 | Ms. Kelly, what is your question? |
| 8 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 9 | Q Yes. Thank you. |
| 10 | So the amounts under this facility |
| 11 | cannot be repaid without also repaying the |
| 12 | debt of the corporation level? |
| 13 | A I believe that's correct. |
| 14 | Q And is that the term sheet for |
| 15 | that corporate debt included anywhere in your |
| 16 | testimony? |
| 17 | A Other than the commitment in the |
| 18 | bridge commitment, no, I don't think so. |
| 19 | Q Just to clarify, so you have |
| 20 | provided the PG&E Company bridge commitment |
| 21 | letter but not the PG&E Corporation bridge |
| 22 | commitment letter that is referenced here? |
| 23 | A I thought we provided both. It's |
| 24 | my hesitation. |
| 25 | Q Perhaps PG&E counsel can clarify |
| 26 | that later. |
| 27 | ALJ COOKE: Yes. After break, we'll |
| 28 | have a clarification from counsel on that. |

0

BY MS. KELLY: 1 2. Okay. Thank you. And in order to be able to prepay the -- to repay the amounts 3 up at the corporation level, where does 4 5 that's money come from? 6 Typically it comes through 7 refinancing what is a short-term debt instruments with a long-term. 8 9 I quess my question was: Is that 10 coming from the company or -- is that money 11 coming from the company or is that money 12 coming from the corporation? 13 Ultimately the money to satisfy the 14 debt would be dividends from the utility. 15 These instruments are what I would consider a 16 form of insurance as a backstop so that we 17 can raise the money despite what is happening 18 in the market upon exit. 19 So, the intention here would be 2.0 that it be repaid with a similar long-term 21 instrument. 22 But in the meantime, until you refinance, all these commitments are the 2.3 24 responsibility of the company and you're 25 seeking approval of those transactions; is 26 that correct? 27 А I am.

And this is my last one, I promise,

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

your Honor. Thank you very, very much for your patience.

prepayments and commitment reductions, on page 26, subsection A, it states that one hundred percent of the net cash proceeds of all asset sales or other disposition, the property of PG&E, the borrower and the respective subsidiaries and any insurance and condemnation proceeds need to prepay the debt. I am paraphrasing. Other than the important phrase "any insurance and condemnation proceeds," is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So, for example, if there were a fire and PG&E received insurance proceeds at the company level, all of those proceeds would be required to go down -- to go to pay down this debt; is that correct?]

A That's correct, because again, this is intended to be short-term in nature.

Q Okay. And say -- say the insurance proceeds are \$500 million. I'm just picking any number. So PG&E Company receives \$500 million in insurance proceeds, and PG&E, the corporation, who has an equivalent-sized facility, would then have to come up with \$500 million to repay their pro rata, their

amount, under their facility. Is that 1 2 correct? Α 3 Yes. And in addition, the insurance 4 0 proceeds are intended for something, are 5 intended to pay for a loss. 6 Is that correct? 7 Α That is correct. So those losses would still have to 8 0 9 be paid for in some way? 10 Д That's correct. 11 0 And how would those losses be 12 compensated otherwise? Through a typical financing. 13 Α 14 facility is just short-term insurance to 15 ensure that we have the committed capital at 16 exit. This is not intended to be a long-term 17 borrowing of the company. 18 I -- I understand that it is not 19 intended to be a long-term borrowing of the 2.0 company. But, my specific interest is for --21 with regards to ratepayers, are -- are they 22 bearing that -- those risks in -- in this 2.3 transaction, which it's solely to understand 24 how this transaction works. 25 So -- so I now understand that if 26 PG&E receives insurance proceeds, it has to 27 pay off a loan. PG&E Corporation would also

at that time also have to pay essentially an

equivalent amount on its loan, and PG&E would 1 2. need to come up with additional money to offset the -- the losses that would otherwise 3 be paid for by insurance? 4 While I agree with that 5 interpretation, it mischaracterizes the 6 7 intent. But, that's what it says on paper? 0 9 Α Yes, but it mischaracterizes the 10 intent. 11 0 And that is what is being committed to under this term sheet? 12 I think the benefit of this is 13 14 regardless of what occurs in the financial 15 markets, and we've seen incredible disruption 16 this week with the Corona virus, customers 17 would have the benefit of the ability for the 18 company to make a timely contribution to the 19 state's wildfire fund, and to participate in 2.0 AB 1054. We had a certainty with this committed financing. It also provides 21 22 victims the comfort that the amounts we 2.3 agreed to pay will be available at exit. 2.4 It's a short-term instrument that is 25 considered to be what I would characterize as insurance on the exit financing. 26 27 agreement works the way you've described, but

it mischaracterizes the -- the intent.

2.8

| 1 | Q And would any refinancing of this |
|----|---|
| 2 | facility have similar terms? |
| 3 | A I don't think so. |
| 4 | Q But, that is not provided in your |
| 5 | testimony? |
| 6 | A It would be uncommon to have the |
| 7 | relationship between the holding company |
| 8 | financing and the utility financing in a |
| 9 | long-term long-term debt debt financing |
| 10 | agreement. |
| 11 | Q And is it common in a short-term |
| 12 | debt financing agreement? |
| 13 | A Yes, because of the what is, in |
| 14 | everybody, the insurance nature of this |
| 15 | committed financing. |
| 16 | MS. KELLY: Thank you, your Honor. I |
| 17 | have no further questions. |
| 18 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |
| 19 | And just for purposes of the record, |
| 20 | since some of the discussion occurred off the |
| 21 | record, we had City and County of |
| 22 | San Francisco ceded their questioning time to |
| 23 | MCE, and Cal Advocates also ceded some of |
| 24 | their time to MCE to allow Ms. Kelly to |
| 25 | finish her line of questioning. |
| 26 | The next cross-examiner is |
| 27 | Mr. Geesman for A4NR. And again, please |
| 28 | speak into the microphone. |

| 1 | MR. GEESMAN: Thank you, your Honor. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 3 | BY MR. GEESMAN: |
| 4 | Q Good morning, Mr. Wells. |
| 5 | A Good morning. |
| 6 | Q I'd like to start with a follow-up |
| 7 | to the question that the judge asked you, and |
| 8 | I will ask you to please explain how it is |
| 9 | that the Chief Financial Officer of this |
| 10 | company is unaware of whether the application |
| 11 | for financial authorization it seeks from |
| 12 | this commission typically includes terms and |
| 13 | conditions of that financing? |
| 14 | A I didn't understand the the |
| 15 | specific term and how that related to the |
| 16 | procedural requirements. I understand the |
| 17 | various filings we make, but I I I |
| 18 | couldn't connect to the to the description |
| 19 | that was provided. |
| 20 | Q You have participated in those |
| 21 | types of applications at this commission |
| 22 | before, have you not? |
| 23 | A I have, yes. |
| 24 | Q Thank you. I'd like to turn to |
| 25 | page 2-3 of your testimony, lines 12 |
| 26 | through 15. |
| 27 | ALJ COOKE: This is in Exhibit PG&E-1? |
| 28 | MR. GEESMAN: Yes, your Honor. |

THE WITNESS: I'm there. 1 BY MR. GEESMAN: 2 Lines 12 through 15, you -- you say 3 that the company will achieve investment 4 grade ratings for secured debt, and also 5 6 expects to have investment grade credit 7 metrics at emergence, and will have a clear path toward improving its credit metrics over 8 time. 9 I believe you clarified with --10 11 with Ms. Kelly that those references to 12 investment grade credit metrics were focused on the unsecured debt of the utility. 13 14 that correct? 15 No, I don't believe that is А 16 correct. 17 Okay. Would you clarify for me? 0 18 Α Can you help me clarify the 19 question you're seeking me to answer? 2.0 When you speak of investment grade 21 metrics --22 Yeah. Α 2.3 -- are you referring to the 0 24 utility's unsecured debt? 25 I'm speaking to the quantitative 26 assessment of the metrics under the plan, not 27 the wholistic credit rating, which would also include assessment of the business risk 2.8

environment. 1 2. But, would that distinguish between the rating on a secured instrument from an 3 unsecured instrument? 4 What I was trying to convey with 5 6 the statement is that on a unsecured and 7 secured basis, I do believe that the quantitative metrics the company is proposing 8 9 under its financial plan would qualify for 10 investment grade. 11 Based on the five-year projections 12 that PG&E has made, when do you expect either Standard & Poor's or Moody's or Fitch to 13 14 recognize PG&E's achievement of these 15 objectives? 16 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection, asked and 17 answered. 18 ALJ COOKE: I do believe Ms. Kelly 19 asked that question. Next question. 2.0 BY MR. GEESMAN: 21 Is there any point during that 22 five-year period when you expect Standard & 2.3 Poor's, Moody's or Fitch to issue a 24 investment grade rating on the utility's 25 unsecured debt? 26 MR. WEISSMANN: Same objection. 27 ALJ COOKE: I'll allow that -- that 28 question.

THE WITNESS: I think they should. 1 2. can't speculate as to the timing, because it's not driven by the financial plan that we 3 put forward, but more of an assessment of the 4 business risk. 5 6 BY MR. GEESMAN: 7 Would you describe that -- the business risk that you believe will drive 8 9 your ratings over the next five years? 10 Α I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? 11 12 Would you describe the business risk that will drive your ratings over the 13 14 five-year period that the company has 15 projected? 16 Α I think it's a reflection of a 17 concern around the California regulatory 18 compact. 19 So that's a blame your regulator type of problem? 2.0 21 Α Not at all. 22 Would you elaborate, then, on what 2.3 problems in the California regulatory compact 24 you believe may prevent PG&E from achieving 25 an investment grade rating on its unsecured 26 debt? 27 Α I -- you know, I think probably the best example of this is while the credit 2.8

| 1 | rating agencies acknowledge that the passage |
|----|---|
| 2 | of AB 1054 was credit positive, they did not |
| 3 | increase the credit rating of Southern |
| 4 | California Edison, specifically pointing to |
| 5 | they wanted to understand the credit |
| 6 | rating agent agencies wanted to understand |
| 7 | how the Commission would apply the new |
| 8 | prudent manager standard under AB 1054. So |
| 9 | there are certain conditions that the |
| LO | financial markets are looking to gain |
| L1 | confidence in the broader California |
| L2 | regulatory environment. |
| L3 | Q And does Southern California Edison |
| L4 | have an investment grade rating on its debt? |
| L5 | A They currently do. |
| L6 | Q So what distinguishes PG&E during |
| L7 | that five-year post emergence period from |
| L8 | Southern California Edison? |
| L9 | A We also will carry the burden of |
| 20 | proving that we can execute on our financial |
| 21 | plan post emergence. |
| 22 | Q And are there prospects under your |
| 23 | investment grade metrics that the debt of the |
| 24 | holding company on an unsecured basis would |
| 25 | achieve an investment grade rating? |
| 26 | A I think it's possible, yes. |
| 27 | Q During those five years? |
| 28 | A Yes. |

Page 2-5, lines 13 through 14 where 1 2. you speak of PG&E's mission of safely and reliably delivering affordable clean energy, 3 is that affordability objective subject to 4 any sort of market price benchmark? 5 6 Α Yes. 7 0 And would you explain what that is? For residential customers, we look Α at the total bill cost. I'm proud to say 9 10 that the company's total bills are about 11 30 percent less than the national average. 12 And how do your rates compare to 13 the national average? 14 They're about a third higher on a Α 15 rate basis. But, as I said, I think, from a 16 residential customer standpoint, the focus is 17 more on the share of wallet, or the total 18 bill that's paid. 19 So you're giving yourself credit 2.0 for operating in a temperate climate? Not at all. 21 Α That is one of the 22 factors, but I'm also proud of the company's 2.3 track record with respect to supporting 24 energy efficiency that has kept per capita 25 consumption flat since the late '80s. 26 When -- when you look at energy consumption 27 per capita for the rest of the country, it

has continued to increase.

| 1 | Q And do you believe your customers |
|----|---|
| 2 | credit PG&E's programs with that |
| 3 | accomplishment? |
| 4 | A I think some do, yes. |
| 5 | Q You think your customers consider |
| 6 | your rates to be affordable? |
| 7 | A I think many have expressed |
| 8 | concerns around it. |
| 9 | Q Page 2-15, lines 7 through 9, you |
| 10 | state, and I'm quoting, "Other material |
| 11 | adverse events may also impair PG&E's ability |
| 12 | to raise capital for its emergence." |
| 13 | Have you performed any stress tests |
| 14 | to determine what financial magnitude of |
| 15 | adverse event your plan would stand without |
| 16 | impairing the company's ability to raise |
| 17 | capital for emergence? |
| 18 | A We have. |
| 19 | Q And what have those stress tests |
| 20 | revealed to you? |
| 21 | A The company has adequate capacity |
| 22 | from a financial metrics standpoint for |
| 23 | material adverse events. Coming back to my |
| 24 | response on the credit ratings, the |
| 25 | qualitative assessment of what occurs will |
| 26 | also factor in, and that is harder to to |
| 27 | pinpoint specifically. |
| 28 | Q Well, let's focus on the |

What threshold of adverse 1 quantitative. 2. event, in your judgment, could your plan 3 withstand without impairing your ability to raise capital for emergence? 4 It is completely facts and 5 6 circumstances based. You know, one situation 7 that we looked at was the risk of a catastrophic fire as we comply with AB 1054. 8 9 The threshold for that may be different than a threshold for a different transaction. 10 So 11 it's not a universal assessment. But, over that period of time that 12 13 you evaluated would it be correct to assume 14 you must have hypothesized an adverse event 15 with a particular dollar consequence at a 16 particular point in time, irrespective of the 17 cause? 18 А I think cause matters. 19 hypothesized about different events 2.0 The threshold for those events is occurring. 21 different depending on the event itself. 22 0 Explain to me how that -- that 2.3 works quantitatively. I'm trying to 24 visualize a spreadsheet, and I'm not certain 25 that the way Excel, for example, works 26 distinguishes between cause of a 27 10 million-dollar hit. So would you

elaborate on your answer?

I'll acknowledge that there is an 1 Α 2. element of subjectivity to it. But, if I -if I could elaborate for one instance, for 3 example, yesterday we received a presiding officer's decision on -- that modified a 5 6 settlement that we extensively negotiated. 7 would say the focus there is more on, again, the regulatory compact and the potential 9 instability that it introduces, and so that 10 threshold is different than, say, a 11 catastrophic fire that is covered by AB 1054. 12 Okay. Focused on the quantitative 13 analysis, once you sorted through all of 14 those subjective factors, was there a dollar 15 amount of hit that you could absorb from an 16 adverse event that you were comfortable with? 17 Α Yes. 18 And what was that threshold? 0 19 Again, it -- it differs by the type Α 2.0 of transaction. So I don't think it -- I --21 I can't summarize it in a simple quantitative 22 The analysis just -- it doesn't threshold. 2.3 lend itself to a singular number. 24 O Okay. Were there a range of 25 numbers that you considered survivable? 26 I mean I think, on one end, if we 27 calculate a loss of 20 percent of the electric T&D equity portion of rate base, 2.8

that is a sizable number that the company 1 2 could withstand. 3 Okay. That's one example. Are there others? 4 And I think the continuum would 5 6 kind of go all the way back to something just -- just north of zero, depending on the 7 other qualitative factors. 8 9 But, at the higher end, it would be 10 20 percent of the company's T&D rate base. 11 Did I understand that correctly? 12 Under specific conditions, yes. Α 13 0 Thank you. And have you done a 14 similar analysis for post emergence material 15 events? 16 Α Yes. That's -- apologies. That's 17 what I was referring to. 18 Okay. Would your answer be 0 19 different if it was focused on emergence or 2.0 preemergence adverse events? 21 Α Likely not materially. 22 Thank you. Page 2-15, lines 18 0 2.3 through 20, you describe the \$6 billion in 24 temporary utility debt. 25 What steps does PG&E intend to take in terms of accounting separation or 26 27 otherwise to quarantee that this temporary utility debt will remain, and I'm quoting 2.8

your testimony, "financial responsibility of 1 shareholders, not customers"? 2. Specifically, it would be addressed 3 Α in the cost of capital proceeding, where we 4 identify the authorized level of rate base 5 6 multiplied times the authorized level of debt to ensure that the cost of financing 7 customers are bearing is only the cost 9 associated with financing our rate base, not additional debt for other needs. 10 11 0 So you're not envisioning using a 12 special purpose vehicle to -- to segregate these cash flows? 13 14 Α Not for purposes of this 15 transaction here. 16 Not a separate account, either? Q 17 Α It certainly would be a separate account in our financial statements, but I 18 19 think the customers can have confidence in 2.0 the application of our cost of capital and 21 what is specifically used to finance rate 22 base. 2.3 So will this temporary utility debt 0 24 be cross-collateralized with or subject to 25 cross-default provisions of other utility 26 debt? I would envision it would be issued 27

on similar terms.

2.8

| 1 | Q And that's a "Yes"? |
|----|---|
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q And what about cross-collateralized |
| 4 | or subject to cross-default provisions of |
| 5 | holding company debt? |
| 6 | A No, I don't I don't believe that |
| 7 | would |
| 8 | Q In I'm sorry. Did I cut you |
| 9 | off? |
| 10 | A (Inaudible response.) |
| 11 | Q In the event of another PG&E |
| 12 | bankruptcy, how would this temporary utility |
| 13 | debt remain, and again quoting your |
| 14 | testimony, "the financial responsibility of |
| 15 | shareholders, not customers"? |
| 16 | A I again, I'll come back to the |
| 17 | customer protections that we are only allowed |
| 18 | to recover the cost of debt associated with |
| 19 | the financing of rate base. So this debt |
| 20 | would continue to be satisfied with the |
| 21 | shareholder net operating losses that are |
| 22 | proposed here. |
| 23 | Q Do you expect the terms of the |
| 24 | temporary utility debt will include a |
| 25 | make-whole provision that would be triggered |
| 26 | in the event of an early redemption? |
| 27 | A Not likely. |
| 28 | Q Now, if I recall correctly |

MR. WEISSMANN: I wasn't sure the 1 witness was done with his answer. 3 THE WITNESS: I was going to expand on Not likely, because what we're proposing 4 here is that the realization of the 5 shareholder NO -- NOLs. As that cash flow is 6 7 generated, it would be used to retire the debt, and so we would traunch that temporary 8 9 debt in a way that would event -- would --10 would minimize any make-whole risk. 11 BY MR. GEESMAN: 12 So you would anticipate, then, that the securities issued to -- to finance this 13 14 temporary utility debt would, in fact, have a 15 make-whole provision, but that would be 16 mitigated by the availability of the NOLs? 17 Α We're looking at both term loans, 18 which would not have any make-whole 19 provision, or a combination of different 2.0 maturities such that we can manage the 21 maturity schedule to minimize make-whole 22 risk. 2.3 When do you envision deciding Q 24 whether -- whether the temporary utility debt 25 will be short-term or long-term? 26 I think initially we will pursue 27 shorter-term temporary debt as the application for securitization is 2.8

1 outstanding. I'm not certain that I understood 2. 3 what -- what you meant by your reference to the -- the application for securitization 4 5 being outstanding. Could you elaborate on 6 that? 7 Separately in my testimony, I referenced a separate application for 8 securitization which we will file -- be 9 10 filing in the coming weeks. The purpose of 11 that securitization, if approved by the 12 Commission, would be, in part, to pay off 13 this temporary debt. And so, as that app- --14 separate application is out -- is 15 outstanding, we would likely use shorter-term 16 debt to minimize any make-whole risk. 17 But, you will have already made a 0 18 decision, will you not, when you issue the 19 \$6 billion as to whether that is short-term 2.0 or long-term. Correct? 21 Α That's correct. 22 And you'll have to make that 2.3 decision before you know whether the 24 Commission approves your -- your application? 25 That's correct. А 26 Okay. You say in Footnote 42 on 27 page 2-16 that the temporary utility debt

will be retired by the realization of

2.8

shareholder NOLs in the event there is no 1 2. securitization transaction. Can you explain how that would work? 3 Yes. As a result of the wildfire 4 victim claims that are being paid in the 5 6 bankruptcy proceeding as well as the wildfire 7 fund contribution under AB 1054, there will be tax benefits generated that will be the 8 9 property of shareholders, since they are 10 funding those underlying costs. The 11 realization of those shareholder tax benefits will come over time as we minimize what would 12 13 have otherwise been payments, tax payments, 14 to the IRS. We will take that cash flow and 15 use it to satisfy either the securitization 16 that's been proposed or the temporary utility 17 debt proposed here. 18 And has PG&E done any Section 382 19 studies to confirm the availability and 2.0 timing of those NOLs? 21 Α Yes, we have. Am I correct in understanding those 22 are confidential? 2.3 24 Α Yes. 25 With respect to the securitization 0 26 transaction, you indicated that you'll be 27 filing that application in the coming weeks? That is correct. 2.8 Α

| 1 | Q Do you have any anticipation when |
|----|---|
| 2 | you might sell the securitization bond? |
| 3 | A Right now, what we have modeled in |
| 4 | our financial projections based on our |
| 5 | assessment of the procedural schedule, could |
| 6 | be as March 31st 31, 2021. |
| 7 | Q I know it's early to do so, but |
| 8 | have you made any projections of likely |
| 9 | maturities of those bonds? |
| 10 | A The securitization bonds? |
| 11 | Q That's correct. |
| 12 | A Yes, we have. |
| 13 | Q And and what do you envision |
| 14 | there? |
| 15 | A Likely, a weighted average |
| 16 | mature maturity of just under 20 years. |
| 17 | Q What type of pricing spread to |
| 18 | treasuries? |
| 19 | A I don't have that figure in front |
| 20 | of me, but one of the reasons why we think it |
| 21 | is in all of the shareholders' interests is |
| 22 | because of its better pricing. I just don't |
| 23 | have the exact figure. |
| 24 | Q But, you probably assumed some |
| 25 | range of spreads, have you not? |
| 26 | A I have. |
| 27 | Q And what what assumptions have |
| 28 | you used? |

| 1 | A I I don't have the figures in |
|----|---|
| 2 | front of me. |
| 3 | Q What occurs to your mind as you sit |
| 4 | here today? |
| 5 | A Below three percent. |
| 6 | Q Spread to treasury? |
| 7 | A I don't know where treasuries are |
| 8 | trading this week. |
| 9 | Q Isn't isn't likely to be a very |
| 10 | representative week. |
| 11 | A Yeah. |
| 12 | Q But, assume your treasury is |
| 13 | treading trading at 1.5 on the ten-year. |
| 14 | A Well, over the weighted average |
| 15 | maturity of those securities, likely a |
| 16 | hundred basis points, 125 basis points. |
| 17 | Q You say at page 2-15, lines 24 |
| 18 | through 26, that PG&E will use the proceeds |
| 19 | from the shareholder-certain tax benefits, |
| 20 | including NOLs and other credits, to provide |
| 21 | rate reductions. |
| 22 | Are there any other specific |
| 23 | accounting mechanisms than those in your cost |
| 24 | of capital proceeding that you anticipate |
| 25 | using to to assure that those revenues are |
| 26 | available? |
| 27 | A As I mentioned, we will track in |
| 28 | our underlying financial records, these items |

separately. But, ultimately, I think the 1 2. confidence that we are not pursuing recovery will be in the application of -- of our cost 3 of capital. 4 But, you don't envision any -- any 5 form of accounting firewall or ringfencing 6 7 to -- to segregate those revenues, do you? We will have separate accounts for 9 those. 10 0 Separate accounts within the same 11 company? 12 Α Correct. What other shareholder-certain tax 13 0 14 benefits besides NOLs do you intend to utilize for the rate reductions that's 15 16 contemplated by your testimony? 17 Α We're still in the process of 18 finalizing that application, and so right 19 now, it's largely based on the utilization of 2.0 net operating losses. We're still evaluating 21 if there's any other opportunities. 22 And just conceptually, what other 2.3 opportunities might there be? 24 Largely, I think it's going to Α 25 really be reflective of the use of the -- the 26 net operating losses. You also mentioned other credits 27 besides the shareholder-certain tax benefits 2.8

that you intend to utilize for these rate 1 2. reductions. What other credits are you talking about? 3 There would be a credit from 4 А shareholders. One transaction that we are 5 contemplating as part of this is a 6 7 securitization that relies on a concept of present value for rate neutrality, because 8 9 the timing of these shareholder NOLs will 10 likely happen up front, and will exceed the 11 cost of the debt, and so we may propose a 12 transaction that relies on present value, and to the extent that we do, then we would need 13 14 to make additional contributions to continue 15 to keep customers rate neutral, on average. 16 We would, in that circumstance, propose to do 17 so. 18 And you would anticipate describing 0 19 that in your application? 2.0 That is correct. Α Yes. 21 Page 2-19, lines 12 through 13, you say that the plan will yield significant 22 2.3 savings associated with lower interest 24 expenses of a utility. What is the lower 25 band, or bound, of what you would consider to 26 be significant savings? 27 Α I think it is -- what we have 2.8 proposed here, I revised my testimony

offering discounted rates on a discounted 1 2. basis. 700 million is significant. Let's go lower. When does it stop 3 Q being significant? 4 I think a rates reduction in any 5 6 case is a benefit, and I think that that is 7 positive for customers. So as long as it is above zero, it 8 9 is neutral; is that correct? 10 А As long as it is above zero, I 11 would say it is in the benefit of the 12 customers. 13 And that would satisfy the rate 14 neutrality test, if I understood you 15 correctly. Am I understanding you right? 16 Α As it relates to this item here, 17 yes. 18 At 2-24, lines 11 through 15, you 0 19 speak positively of a significant flexibility 2.0 PG&E gained from the terms of its \$12 billion 21 in equity backstop commitments. Why does the 22 PG&E Plan of Reorganization contemplate a 23 capital structure of only 9 billion in common 24 equity? 25 I think the capital structure we 26 proposed really reflects shareholder 27 contributions of a total of \$16 billion. 2.8 is reflective of 9 billion in common equity

| 1 | upfront, and over time the contribution of |
|----|---|
| 2 | over \$7 billion in shareholder net operating |
| 3 | loses. So the proposal is actually higher |
| 4 | than what we have included in the original |
| 5 | commitment letters. |
| 6 | Q And does that \$16 billion number |
| 7 | include the infusion of equity that will come |
| 8 | from the holding company's sale of unsecured |
| 9 | debt? |
| 10 | A I did not include that amount in my |
| 11 | calculation. |
| 12 | Q So that would be even on top of the |
| 13 | 16, would it not? |
| 14 | A That is correct. |
| 15 | Q Why don't you include that when you |
| 16 | describe the contribution from shareholders? |
| 17 | A I could have. |
| 18 | Q At Footnote 50 on page 26 you say |
| 19 | that PG&E also anticipates filing a separate |
| 20 | request for long-term financing authorization |
| 21 | to address PG&E's post-emergence long-term |
| 22 | financing needs. I take it that is separate |
| 23 | from the securitization application? |
| 24 | A Do you mind referencing a line? |
| 25 | Q It is Footnote 50. It is on |
| 26 | page 26. |
| 27 | A Oh, sorry. |
| 28 | This is separate from the |

```
securitization transaction.
                                   These are the
 1
 2
     long-term debt authorizations that I
     reference in cross.
 3
               When do you anticipate making that
 4
           0
     filing?
 5
               I asked for the authorization as
 6
 7
     part of my testimony here.
           0
               Okay. I'm clear now.
 8
 9
               Last subject I wanted to touch on
10
     are the pollution control bonds. I wonder if
11
     you would explain what the company's intent
12
     is with respect to the existing pollution
     control bonds?
13
14
           Α
               May I correct my previous answer?
15
           0
               Yes.
16
           Α
               Apologies.
                            The short-term debt
17
     authorizations that I referenced in my
18
     testimony are for the exit. Given the
     $40 billion, or nearly $40 billion that we
19
2.0
     plan to invest in our rate base, we will need
21
     additional post-emergence long-term debt
22
     authorization to fund that growth.
                                          That was
2.3
     what I was referring to here, and those would
24
     come post-emergence as the rate base is
25
     going.
26
           ALJ COOKE:
                       As a new application?
27
           THE WITNESS:
                          Yes.
     BY MR. GEESMAN:
2.8
```

| 1 | Q When would you anticipate making |
|----|---|
| 2 | that new application? |
| 3 | A Well before the financing |
| 4 | authorization is needed. |
| 5 | Q But in your five-year projection |
| 6 | have you made any assumption as to when you |
| 7 | would be filing that application or when that |
| 8 | financing would be needed? |
| 9 | A Given the growth, we will likely |
| 10 | have new financing needs in 2021. |
| 11 | Q So you would anticipate the |
| 12 | application coming before that? |
| 13 | A Yes. |
| 14 | Q And based on your five-year |
| 15 | projections, what amounts are likely to be |
| 16 | involved? |
| 17 | A I don't have the exact figure. It |
| 18 | would be the growth in rate base |
| 19 | attributable. I don't have the figure on top |
| 20 | of mind. |
| 21 | Q General range in your mind? |
| 22 | A Probably on an order of rate |
| 23 | base is growing kind of roughly 3 billion a |
| 24 | year, half of that funded, not exactly, with |
| 25 | debt. So maybe a billion and a half |
| 26 | annually, roughly. It will obviously be |
| 27 | dependent on the specific financial needs at |
| 28 | that time on average over the life of the |

| five years. |
|---|
| Q Thank you. |
| Now I wonder if you would describe |
| for me what is going on with the pollution |
| control bonds you currently have outstanding. |
| What are your future plans for those? |
| A Plan is to refinance those upon |
| exit. |
| Q All of them? |
| A Yes. |
| Q I believe your testimony makes |
| reference, or rather a discovery response |
| that you provided indicated that you would be |
| foregoing the tax-exempt benefit of about 800 |
| million; is that correct? |
| A I believe that is correct. |
| Q So if you were foregoing that |
| tax-exempt benefit, you would be refinancing |
| them with taxable bonds? |
| A That is correct. |
| Q Why would you do that? |
| A The spread between the tax |
| component and taxable pollution control bonds |
| have narrowed significantly over the years. |
| Q Those bonds would still be secured |
| by direct pay of letters of credit? |
| A I don't know. |
| MR. GEESMAN: Those are all my |
| |

| 1 | questions. I want to thank you very much. |
|----|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Geesman. |
| 3 | I think this would be a good time |
| 4 | for a brief 10-minute break. So everybody |
| 5 | please be back by 10:22. Off the record. |
| 6 | (Recess taken.) |
| 7 | ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. |
| 8 | Ms. Sheriff for CLECA. |
| 9 | MS. SHERIFF: Thank you. Good morning, |
| 10 | your Honor. |
| 11 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 12 | BY MS. SHERIFF: |
| 13 | Q Good morning, Mr. Wells. |
| 14 | A Good morning. |
| 15 | Q I represent the California Large |
| 16 | Energy Consumers Association, or CLECA. |
| 17 | At page 2-14 of what has been |
| 18 | marked for identification as Exhibit PG&E-1, |
| 19 | you talk about conditions precedent to plan |
| 20 | confirmation and effectiveness. What do you |
| 21 | mean by "conditions precedent"? |
| 22 | A Conditions that would be needed for |
| 23 | planned confirmation. |
| 24 | Q So, for example, you state at |
| 25 | line 24 to 28 that PG&E requests that the |
| 26 | Commission rule in Investigation 15-08-019 |
| 27 | that PG&E will not be forced to, and then you |
| 28 | list several options that have been proposed |

1 in that proceeding. 2. Is the company asking Judge Allen 3 to draft a proposed decision in the Safety 4 Culture Proceeding granting this request, and 5 for the Commission to adopt it in the next 6 few months? 7 Α We think that it is in the customers' interest as part of this 9 proceeding here, yes. 10 So you are asking the Commission to Q 11 do that? 12 Α Yes. 13 ALJ COOKE: Let me interject here. you then saying that if such a decision is 14 15 not forthcoming between now on June 30th, 16 that you will not be able to emerge? 17 THE WITNESS: It is a complicated 18 I don't think it is a -- the short answer. 19 answer is no. 2.0 The longer answer is this is one of 21 the largest, will be the largest capital 22 raise in the utility industry and one of the 2.3 largest in corporate history. The more that 24 we can provide stability, the more effective 25 this capital raise will be. 26 ALJ COOKE: Thank you. 27 MS. SHERIFF: You asked the next 2.8 question, your Honor.

I thought I might. 1 ALJ COOKE: 2 BY MS. SHERIFF: At page 2-15 and 2-16 and 2-17, Mr. 3 Q 4 Wells, you talk about temporary utility debt, 5 and net operating losses and a proposed post-emergence rate neutral \$7 billion 6 7 securitization transaction. Is that proposed securitization of the \$7 billion necessary to 8 9 enable PG&E to exit bankruptcy? 10 Α It is not necessary. No. 11 O Thank you. 12 If the Commission were to deny 13 PG&E's request to securitize the \$7 billion 14 of debt postbankruptcy, would PG&E be unable 15 to refinance the \$6 billion in short-term 16 debt currently targeted for repaying the wildfire victims? 17 18 А We would be able to refinance. 19 O Thank you. 2.0 Could PG&E use the cash flows from 21 the net operating loses you reference in your 22 testimony directly to support the 6 billion 2.3 in utility debt, which is needed to pay the wildfire victims? 24 25 That is the intention, if А 26 unapproved. 27 0 Thank you. 2.8 In terms of net operating losses,

you've also referenced another investigation, 1 2. 19-06-015, in your testimony in the discussion of conditions precedent. Between 3 that proceeding and the plan of 4 5 reorganization and bankruptcy there are two sets of net operating losses, right? 6 7 you have two different sets of losses there, a much larger one here, about 27 billion, and 9 then a smaller one in that I.19-06-015. that's 2 billion, a little over 2 billion? 10 11 Α That is correct. 12 So my question to you now is: 13 Because you have those distinct, separate 14 sets of net operating losses, how will PG&E 15 apportion or attribute two different net 16 operating losses, right? If you attribute 17 the 2.137 billion from I.19-06-015 to 18 ratepayers, and then the much larger chunk, 19 the 27 billion, to go to the short-term 2.0 utility debt, how will you track that? 21 We track all of these line items 22 separately. 23 If I may correct my previous 24 statement. We actually have a third group of 25 net operating losses when the company filed 26 for bankruptcy. The company had net 27 operating losses that were not referenced in

the two that you mentioned. We track all of

| 1 | that separately. |
|--|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Just a moment. I would |
| 3 | just like to note for the record that |
| 4 | Mr. Rechtschaffen has joined me on the dais. |
| 5 | Go ahead, Ms. Sheriff. |
| 6 | MS. SHERIFF: Thank you. Good morning, |
| 7 | commissioner. |
| 8 | Q Will it take you a long time to |
| 9 | write off the \$27 billion in net operating |
| 10 | losses that are contemplated here in this |
| 11 | bankruptcy? |
| 12 | A We haven't quantified the exact |
| 13 | time line. But, yes, it will be multiple |
| 14 | years. |
| | |
| 15 | Q So will the ratepayers be |
| 15 16 | Q So will the ratepayers be reimbursed in the first couple of years worth |
| | |
| 16 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth |
| 16 17 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the |
| 16 17 18 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do |
| 16 17 18 19 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of the longer term writing off of the NOLs? |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of the longer term writing off of the NOLs? A Apologies. Can you help clarify |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of the longer term writing off of the NOLs? A Apologies. Can you help clarify that question? |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of the longer term writing off of the NOLs? A Apologies. Can you help clarify that question? Q So you've got I'm not going to |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of the longer term writing off of the NOLs? A Apologies. Can you help clarify that question? Q So you've got I'm not going to worry about the third set of NOLs. I'm just |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | reimbursed in the first couple of years worth of the net operating losses or the 2.137 billion in I.19-06-015, or will you do it as sort of a 3.7 percent in each year of the longer term writing off of the NOLs? A Apologies. Can you help clarify that question? Q So you've got I'm not going to worry about the third set of NOLs. I'm just looking at the two |

investigation I.19-06-015, and then 27.137 1 2 billion from the plan of reorganization. I'm looking to understand how will 3 the ratepayers see the 2.137 billion of NOLs 4 from I.19-06-015. Will it be refunded in 5 6 years one, two and three entirely? Or will 7 you do sort of a pro rata treatment over a longer term? Because, as you said, it will 8 9 take you a while to write off the entire amount of the NOLs. 10 11 Α Thank you for the clarification. 12 In short, I don't know. We are 13 currently evaluating the presiding officer's 14 decision that was released last night. And I 15 don't have an answer this morning. 16 Q Okay. 17 ALJ COOKE: One more minute. 18 BY MS. SHERIFF: At page 2-23, lines 3 to 5, you 19 20 state that you have confidence in the 21 company's ability to raise both equity and 22 debt. Do you still have that confidence 2.3 today? 24 I do. Α 25 And then --0 Okay. 26 MR. WEISSMANN: Wait. I'm sorry. 27 Were you done with your answer? 28 MS. SHERIFF: May he please expand on

| 1 | redirect, your Honor? |
|-----|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Yes. |
| 3 | BY MS. SHERIFF: |
| 4 | Q You also say at lines 9 to 10 that |
| 5 | a clear path to further you talk about a |
| 6 | clear path to further improving the company's |
| 7 | credit metrics. Does that involve |
| 8 | participation in the wildfire fund? |
| 9 | A That is credit positive. But this |
| 10 | sentence here was referring to the |
| 11 | improvement of the quantitative metrics |
| 12 | according to the financial plan. |
| 13 | Q Does PG&E's projection I'm |
| 14 | sorry. Does PG&E's projection of an ability |
| 15 | to obtain investment grade debt depend on its |
| 16 | participation in the wildfire fund? |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q Do you know the what the |
| 19 | unsecured credit ratings of Southern |
| 20 | California Edison and San Diego Gas & |
| 21 | Electric Company are? |
| 22 | A Generally, yes. |
| 23 | Q What are they? |
| 24 | A I believe Southern California |
| 25 | Edison is BBB, and I believe SDG&E is either |
| 26 | BBB+ or A |
| 27 | |
| _ / | Q And you say you are still digesting |

night in I.19-06-015, have you studied 1 2. various possibilities in your -- you referenced Section 302 studies with 3 Mr. Geesman. Have you studied various 5 timings and how streams of tax benefits would be achieved? 6 7 Α Yes. MS. SHERIFF: Thank you, your Honor. 9 have nothing further. 10 ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. Mr. 11 Abrams. 12 MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 14 BY MR. ABRAMS: 15 Thank you, Mr. Wells. 0 16 I am, just by way of background, a wildfire survivor. In bankruptcy they call 17 18 us "victims." And as part of that, through 19 this bankruptcy proceeding, that means that 2.0 we are going to be apparently in a trust that 21 holds 21 percent of shares. So from that 22 perspective, I'll be asking you questions 23 today. 24 I feel an extra duty to talk as a 25 victim, because the attorneys who are not DCC 26 attorneys are precluded from doing so because 27 of the RSA, which is unfortunate. 28 Taking a look, first I'm trying to

understand the degree to which you see the 1 2 actions of PG&E tied to the financials of the victims. Are you aware that 50 percent of 3 the settlement for victims will be paid in 5 shares as opposed to cash? Yes, I am. 6 Α 7 Are you aware that many of these victims are rebuilding homes and reliant upon 8 9 that money to be able to rebuild their homes and their lives? 10 11 Д I am aware. 12 Do you take that responsibility 13 very seriously? 14 Α Absolutely. 15 Do you also understand that there 16 is a link between PG&E's actions and these very same folks in terms of being able to 17 18 afford insurance and being able to have 19 insurance in their homes that are next to the 2.0 PG&E lines? 21 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Beyond the 22 scope. 2.3 MR. ABRAMS: It is directly related to 24 safety and security. 25 ALJ COOKE: I'll let him respond. 26 Please answer to the best of your ability. 27 THE WITNESS: I understand there are a 2.8 number of challenges and factors that are

impacting the ability to procure residential 1 home insurance in fire prone areas, yes. 2. BY MR. ABRAMS: 3 Would you say that the PG&E 4 0 wildfires are a significant contributor to 5 those insurance rates? 6 7 Α I'm not aware. You are not aware. Do you have 8 0 active communications with the insurance 9 10 industry to understand those implications? 11 Α Yes, we do. 12 And from that dialogue, what are --13 what is your understanding regarding your 14 impacts on those rates? 15 We regularly engage with the 16 insurance markets. The focus the insurance 17 markets have had sort of more broadly is fire 18 risk generally. Obviously, given the 2015, 19 '17 and '18 wildfires, insurers want to 2.0 understand the programs we are undertaking to mitigate fire risk. 21 They point to a 22 multitude of factors that are impacting the 2.3 availability of insurance. 24 Is it your understanding from 25 that -- from those discussions that they base 26 their rating on subjective measures of how well things are going. And is that typically 27

how they do rates, or do they sort of measure

2.8

the risk? 1 2. I don't exactly know how they apprise residential homeowners insurance. 3 That wasn't my question. Do you 4 0 5 consider that they measure the risk, or do you think they go on subjective measures, 6 7 like other factors? Do you think they measure risk? 8 9 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Lacks 10 foundation. He is asking him how insurance 11 companies price. 12 ALJ COOKE: Let me have you repeat the 13 question, Mr. Abrams. 14 BY MR. ABRAMS: 15 Your understanding from the 0 16 discussions with the insurance carriers, do 17 they measure risk? 18 Α I think they try to quantify risk, 19 yes. 2.0 0 Thank you. 21 If they are trying to quantify 22 risk, does your quantification of risk and 2.3 risk mitigation, are you providing those 24 figures to them so that they can provide 25 better homeowners insurance for your customers? 26 27 They have not asked, nor have we 2.8 provided our calculations.

Who have you provided your 1 0 Okav. 2 calculations to? Liability insurance companies that 3 Α provide the company insurance for future 4 5 events, as opposed to insurance companies that underwrite insurance for homeowners 6 7 themselves. Are those publicly available 9 numbers? 10 Α The quantification of our wildfire 11 risk is included as part of our Enterprise 12 Risk Management Program and part of the SMAP process here at this Commission. 13 14 Are those the same numbers, or are 15 they different numbers or different level of 16 detail that you provide to those insurance 17 companies versus what you provide to the 18 Commission? 19 It is the same. Α 2.0 0 Same numbers. Thank you. 21 I would like to now turn to the 22 exhibit, I think it was X-9 that I submitted? It is Abrams-X-9 a Better 2.3 ALJ COOKE: 24 Way Out of PG&E Bankruptcy. Is that what you 25 are referring to? 26 MR. ABRAMS: Yes, your Honor. 27 ALJ COOKE: Do you have a copy of that, Mr. Wells? 2.8

THE WITNESS: I do. 1 Thank you. 2 BY MR. ABRAMS: I would like to be able to walk 3 through the particular points associated with 4 5 This is an op-ed that was put forth by 6 Sam Liccardo, who I understand is the Mayor of San Jose; correct? 7 А That is correct. 9 So on the first page, one of his 10 statements is that: masterfully sprinkling 11 billions among the company's most powerful 12 stakeholders-hedge funds, shareholders and 13 bondholders-perhaps -- along with perhaps \$1 14 billion in fees to consultants, banks and 15 attorneys. 16 Is your understanding that that is a true and accurate statement of what you've 17 18 done? 19 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Lacks 2.0 foundation. 21 MR. ABRAMS: This is directly related 22 to what the finances are and where the dollars go. 2.3 24 MR. WEISSMANN: That wasn't my 25 My objection is he didn't write objection. this document, and he lacks foundation about 26 27 the statements made here. You can ask him about his exhibit, which he goes into great 2.8

detail about the fees that are sought to be 1 2 recovered. I don't think it is correct or fair to ask him to comment on adjectives that 3 this author has chosen to use. ALJ COOKE: Mr. Wells, would you agree 5 6 that the places that this article states that 7 funds will be going to is accurate, regardless of whether you agree with the 8 9 characterization of the purpose of that effort? 10 11 THE WITNESS: I disagree with the 12 characterization, but the figures are 13 generally accurate. 14 ALJ COOKE: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. ABRAMS: 15 16 Then the next sentence of the 17 document it indicates that the bankruptcy is 18 being put forward over the California Public 19 Utilities Commission again and again. 2.0 is similar to Governor Newsom's objection 21 that he raised in the bankruptcy proceeding 22 that PG&E's objective through putting this 2.3 bankruptcy forward is to hurry up the 24 California Public Utilities Commission to 25 make a hasty decision. 26 Is that your characterization and 27 understanding? 2.8 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Lacks

| 1 | foundation. |
|----|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Let's just start out with |
| 3 | he can ask him his understanding of the words |
| 4 | on the paper, and let's dispense with the |
| 5 | objections. I'm going to let him answer |
| 6 | those questions. |
| 7 | MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 8 | ALJ COOKE: Do you have those questions |
| 9 | in mind? |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: I disagree with the |
| 11 | characterization. |
| 12 | BY MR. ABRAMS: |
| 13 | Q On the next page it states that |
| 14 | this bankruptcy tethers the victims' |
| 15 | financial futures to the performance of the |
| 16 | company. |
| 17 | Do you agree with that statement? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q Thank you. |
| 20 | And the next sentence it states, it |
| 21 | also saddles those families with the risks of |
| 22 | any future wildfires started by PG&E's |
| 23 | failing equipment. |
| 24 | Would you agree with that |
| 25 | statement? |
| 26 | A I don't agree with the |
| 27 | characterization. |
| 28 | Q Do you agree that the families, the |

victims who are relying upon this money, that 1 2 they have risks associated with that investment? 3 I would agree that there is some 4 risk associated with that investment. 5 6 Would you say that these risks 7 would increase if PG&E started another wildfire? 8 9 It is hard to speculate. 10 Obviously, a fire would be catastrophic. But under what conditions? There are many 11 12 questions I would have. So if PG&E -- I'm trying to 13 14 understand this a little bit further. Ιf 15 PG&E starts a catastrophic wildfire, do you 16 expect that the risks to these victims' 17 investment will be adversely affected? 18 А I think there is risk, yes. 19 It doesn't -- I'm asking if the 2.0 risk increases. So there is a wildfire. 1 21 Α The risk increases, yes. 22 0 Thank you. I thought that would be obvious. 2.3 24 MR. WEISSMANN: Object to the 25 statement. 26 ALJ COOKE: Let's just stick to the 27 questions. 28 I will, your Honor. MR. ABRAMS: Thank

| 1 | you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q Do you understand that as a victim |
| 3 | that these are difficult questions for me to |
| 4 | be asking? |
| 5 | A I do. And I apologize for what you |
| 6 | have gone through, as well as the other |
| 7 | victims. |
| 8 | Q Thank you. In the next paragraph |
| 9 | let me sorry. Let me take this back. |
| 10 | Do you agree that part of what this |
| 11 | bankruptcy does and this bankruptcy agreement |
| 12 | is it transfers risk from some of your |
| 13 | entrenched investors to victims? |
| 14 | A I would not agree with that |
| 15 | assessment. |
| 16 | Q Moving on to the next paragraph, |
| 17 | the second sentence: |
| 18 | In the 23-month span, over |
| 19 | which the company's wires |
| 20 | ignited 18 wildfires, |
| 21 | killing 107 people and |
| 22 | destroying 15,700 homes, |
| 23 | the company's shares |
| 24 | plummeted 90 percent. |
| 25 | Is that a true statement? |
| 26 | A I believe it is. I haven't |
| 27 | recalculated. The stock declined, but yes |
| 28 | directional. |

| 1 | Q So I guess this goes back to the |
|----|--|
| 2 | earlier question when I asked you would a |
| 3 | wildfire affect the shares associated with |
| 4 | victims. I guess the answer is |
| 5 | categorically, yes; is that correct? |
| 6 | A A wildfire would increase risk of |
| 7 | financial results, yes. |
| 8 | Q Yes. Thank you. In the next |
| 9 | paragraph, it states that a federal court |
| 10 | monitor found that PG&E falsified documents. |
| 11 | Is that a true statement? |
| 12 | A Yes, it is. |
| 13 | Q Given that, would you say that |
| 14 | there's a significant trust gap between what |
| 15 | victims have experienced first-hand, these |
| 16 | additional illegal transgressions that must |
| 17 | be overcome by PG&E? |
| 18 | A I recognize that we need to rebuild |
| 19 | trust for the communities we serve, wildfire |
| 20 | victims and all of the stakeholders for |
| 21 | support. |
| 22 | Q In the next paragraph it states |
| 23 | that all cash payments as part of this |
| 24 | agreement were provided to insurance |
| 25 | companies. Is that a correct statement? |
| 26 | A That is a correct statement. |
| 27 | Q In the next sentence it says, |
| 28 | "Hedge funds gobbled up insurance claims at |

| 1 | steep discounts and will reap the steep |
|----|--|
| 2 | profits in their 11 billion payout in cash, |
| 3 | not in stock." It is that a true statement? |
| 4 | A I can't speak specifically to what |
| 5 | they paid. I don't know what they paid for |
| 6 | these claims. |
| 7 | Q So, is it safe to state that the |
| 8 | savvy entrenched investors have more |
| 9 | protection for their investment than they do |
| 10 | less savvy by-in-large victims associated |
| 11 | with your fires? |
| 12 | A I don't agree with the |
| 13 | characterization. |
| 14 | Q Were there asset liens provided |
| 15 | through this bankruptcy process? |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q Are asset liens providing security |
| 18 | for those investments? |
| 19 | A We're requesting security for the |
| 20 | debt that we're issuing at exit, yes. |
| 21 | Q So, yes, they provide security for |
| 22 | those investments? |
| 23 | A It's not I apologize. It's not |
| 24 | our investment. They're providing security |
| 25 | for the debt that we intend to issue. |
| 26 | Q Are their investments more secure |
| 27 | because they have asset liens? |
| 28 | A Compared to? |

| 1 | Q Compared to where they were before |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | Q Before they got the asset liens? |
| 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | Q So if they get asset liens and have |
| 7 | more security, would the converse not also be |
| 8 | true that because the victims do not have |
| 9 | asset liens, they are less secure? |
| 10 | A I think that is a factual statement |
| 11 | that equity is subordinate to debt and debt |
| 12 | that is secured with an asset lien, yes. |
| 13 | Q Thank you. |
| 14 | In the next paragraph, it states: |
| 15 | PG&E's plan also unfairly |
| 16 | dilutes the victims' claims |
| 17 | by committing to secure |
| 18 | bondholder claims. |
| 19 | So does it dilute victims' claims, |
| 20 | the fact that the bondholders claims have |
| 21 | been secured? |
| 22 | A I don't agree with that statement. |
| 23 | Q From your understanding of the |
| 24 | bankruptcy process, what came first? The TCC |
| 25 | RSA deal or the bondholder deal? |
| 26 | MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Beyond the |
| 27 | scope. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: Could you repeat the |

| 1 | question? |
|----|---|
| 2 | BY MR. ABRAMS: |
| 3 | Q Is your understanding as the Chief |
| 4 | Financial Officer which came first, the |
| 5 | bondholder RSA or the TCC RSA in terms of how |
| 6 | this the timeline? |
| 7 | A We executed the TCC RSA settlement |
| 8 | before the noteholder RSA settlement. |
| 9 | Q Thank you. Given that order, would |
| 10 | you say that the implications to the |
| 11 | noteholder RSA could not have been |
| 12 | incorporated into the TCC RSA because what |
| 13 | transpired and the agreement came after they |
| 14 | agreed to the TCC RSA? |
| 15 | MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Beyond the |
| 16 | scope. |
| 17 | ALJ COOKE: Can you repeat the question |
| 18 | again? |
| 19 | BY MR. ABRAMS: |
| 20 | Q The noteholder RSA, as you have |
| 21 | stated, came after the TCC RSA. So they |
| 22 | signed, executed the agreement for the TCC |
| 23 | RSA first; then came the noteholder RSA. So |
| 24 | the implications to the noteholder RSA were |
| 25 | not incorporated into or accounted for before |
| 26 | the signatures and the commitment to the TCC |
| 27 | RSA; is that not correct? |
| 28 | MR. WEISSMANN: Objection, your Honor. |
| | |

| 1 | We are seeking to relitigate matters that are |
|----|---|
| 2 | within the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy |
| 3 | Court. |
| 4 | MR. ABRAMS: I am not. I am trying to |
| 5 | get underneath the financials. |
| 6 | ALJ COOKE: I'm going to allow the |
| 7 | witness to answer to the best of his ability. |
| 8 | THE WITNESS: Do you mind rephrasing |
| 9 | the question again? I apologize. |
| 10 | ALJ COOKE: Let me ask the question I |
| 11 | think. |
| 12 | Given that the noteholder agreement |
| 13 | was entered into after the TCC agreement was |
| 14 | entered into, do you believe that the TCC |
| 15 | agreement does or does not include or reflect |
| 16 | on how it would be impacted based on the |
| 17 | noteholder agreement? |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: I think the execution of |
| 19 | the noteholder RSA is a benefit to the TCC |
| 20 | RSA. |
| 21 | MR. ABRAMS: That's not my question. |
| 22 | ALJ COOKE: That's the question that is |
| 23 | before him. |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: I think yes, I think |
| 25 | it is a benefit to the TCC RSA that we were |
| 26 | able to negotiate the noteholder RSA |
| 27 | afterwards. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: And do you believe that |

```
the, or do you have any knowledge as to
 1
     whether or not the entities that entered into
 2.
     the TCC agreement were aware of the terms of
 3
     the RSA at the point at which they entered
 5
     into the TCC agreement?
                               I don't think that
 6
           THE WITNESS:
                         No.
 7
     the individuals that executed the TCC did so
     at a time with an understanding of the terms
 9
     of the noteholder RSA. It was done well
10
     before.
11
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Okay.
                               Thank you.
12
     BY MR. ABRAMS:
               Thank you. Given that the TCC
13
           0
14
     represents the victims who are part of this
15
     shareholder class, wouldn't you say that that
16
     put them at a significant disadvantage to
     being able to assess the financial
17
18
     implications for which the deal they signed,
19
     given that the noteholder RSA came after?
2.0
           MR. WEISSMANN:
                           Objection. Beyond the
21
     scope.
22
           ALJ COOKE: I will allow the witness to
2.3
     answer.
24
           THE WITNESS:
                         Not necessarily.
                                            The
25
     resolution of the noteholder RSA is a benefit
26
     for all stakeholders in the bankruptcy case.
27
     It creates stability.
     ///
2.8
```

BY MR. ABRAMS: 1 2. 0 Is that your opinion or fact? Α It's a fact. 3 Do you understand as part of this 4 0 TCC RSA that there were provisions within 5 6 that agreement that would prevent the TCC 7 attorneys to be able to talk about the benefits and about perhaps some of the 8 9 detrimental effects of what transpired after 10 because they already executed their agreement and so are not free to be able to speak to 11 12 the impacts that came after they were in the 13 noteholder RSA? Are you aware of those 14 provisions? 15 I am aware of those provisions, but 16 I don't agree with the characterization. 17 How would you characterize the 0 18 silence of the TCC after these signatures on 19 the TCC RSA? 2.0 I think the noteholder RSA is a Α 21 benefit for all stakeholders as part of this 22 case. First, it eliminates any litigation 2.3 risk; it creates support by all claimants in 24 the bankruptcy for the Plan of Reorganization 25 that was based. That creates stability and 26 helps improve the exit financing. 27 addition, the noteholder RSA allows for their

reduction of customer rates as it relates to

interest expense, which is a benefit for 1 2. customers. So I think it's actually a benefit to all. 3 Okay. My next questions will 4 0 5 challenge those assumptions. It was indicated on the next 6 7 paragraph of the same exhibit that the expectation is from Mayor Liccardo is that 8 9 the company will receive a junk-level credit 10 rating upon exit from bankruptcy. Is that 11 your understanding, yes or no? 12 I anticipate the issuer rating to 13 be sub-investment grade. I anticipate the 14 bond rating to be investment grade. 15 So when you say sub-investment, Q 16 help me understand "sub" versus "junk." 17 Α One in the same. 18 0 One in the same. So it is a 19 correct statement then? 2.0 The bonds themselves will be Α 21 investment grade; the issuer rating will be 22 as phrased here sub-investment grade or junk. 2.3 Thank you. At the bottom of that Q 24 paragraph, it states 38 billion in debt and 25 pay billions of dollars a year in interest. 26 So this debt increased, correct me if I am 27 wrong, generally from 34 billion to 38

billion through the deal; is that correct, so

| 1 | it increased the debt? |
|----|---|
| 2 | A This deal didn't specifically |
| 3 | increase the debt. This deal that was |
| 4 | pre-conditioned debt was outstanding at the |
| 5 | time of bankruptcy and did not address debt |
| 6 | that we anticipated on issuing upon exit. |
| 7 | Q Did it contribute to the increase |
| 8 | of the debt? |
| 9 | A It did not increase the level of |
| 10 | total debt. |
| 11 | Q Did it contribute to it? |
| 12 | A It did not contribute to it. |
| 13 | Q Is it a correct statement that |
| 14 | billions of dollars a year in interest will |
| 15 | need to be paid? |
| 16 | A It is a correct statement, yes. |
| 17 | Q In the next paragraph, it states |
| 18 | the results would be hefty rate hikes. Do |
| 19 | you believe that the results will be hefty |
| 20 | rate hikes? |
| 21 | A No. I disagree with that |
| 22 | statement. |
| 23 | Q Do you believe that the result will |
| 24 | be any rate hikes? |
| 25 | A No. The plan that we are proposing |
| 26 | actually reduces customer rates as it relates |
| 27 | to this plan. |
| 28 | Q I am going to move to the last |
| | |

| 1 | sentence of this paragraph. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Company executives have |
| 3 | little to fear. However, |
| 4 | by turning wildfire victims |
| 5 | into shareholders, they |
| 6 | will have created a |
| 7 | sympathetic bulwark against |
| 8 | customer objections. |
| 9 | I would like to explore that a |
| 10 | little bit. If PG&E needed to hike rates |
| 11 | because say you had another wildfire, would |
| 12 | you say that it would be more difficult for |
| 13 | the California Public Utilities Commission to |
| 14 | be able to not grant rate hikes if victims |
| 15 | were counting on it to rebuild half their |
| 16 | homes and half their lives? |
| 17 | A I don't agree with that statement. |
| 18 | Q So victims, being made shareholders |
| 19 | through this agreement, would have a vested |
| 20 | interest in seeing a greater return on that |
| 21 | investment; is that correct? |
| 22 | A That would be correct. |
| 23 | Q Do higher rates lead to, |
| 24 | oftentimes, greater return for investors? |
| 25 | A No. |
| 26 | Q They don't? There is no |
| 27 | relationship between the rates you pay and |
| 28 | what return goes to investors? |

statement.

Our business model is cost of 1 Α 2. service. So our rates are adjusted for the cost to provide our electric and gas 3 customers. Separate and a part from that, we 4 set the authorized levels of the financing 5 costs to finance the business. 6 If the 7 Commission decides to adjust the authorized financing levels, they can impact rates. 9 What we have seen over the last 10 decade is that rates have been more driven by the level of investment in our system which 11 has nothing to do with profits for 12 shareholders. 13 14 So, I am not familiar with all the 15 things that you just said. So if you could 16 help me boil it down, so it sounds to me from what you said, and correct me if I am wrong, 17 18 that there is some relationship between rates 19 and what investors get paid; is that correct? 2.0 А There is a relationship, yes. 21 Given that relationship, victims who are now investors will want to make sure 22 2.3 to the best of their ability, just like any investor would, would want to see a greater 24 25 return on their investment; is that a correct 26 statement? 27 А I think that is a correct

Given that, would you expect that a 1 0 victim who is also a customer like other 2. investors would have sort of a conflict, if 3 you will, or a difficult decision, because on 5 the one hand they want to keep rates low so 6 that they have lower energy bills, but on the 7 other hand there may be, through increased rates, ability for them to get a greater 9 return. Is that sort of a natural 10 assumption? 11 Δ I think it overstates the 12 relationship. So if I'm a victim, and I want the 13 14 stock price to go up, because now I am a 15 shareholder and I live next to somebody in my 16 community who is not a victim, their home was 17 spared from the PG&E fires, my neighbor would 18 like to keep rates as low as possible because 19 he has got no upside associated with 2.0 increased rates, only down side, the victim 21 on the other hand has this difficulty because 22 he would like to see a great return on his 2.3 investment. Given that, do you see that this 24 discontentment amongst neighbors helps the 25 customers and helps the Commission and helps 26 the public? 27 I still would disagree with this

characterization. I do think it's in

2.8

shareholders' interest to keep rates 1 affordable, providing what is an essential 2. service to Northern and Central California. 3 I think shareholders' reward is actually affordable service, as opposed to looking for 5 rate increases. So I just fundamentally 6 7 disagree with the assertion. Would you agree with the assertion that "affordable" is not a fixed number --9 "affordable" is not a fixed number. I know 10 11 there is some range there. 12 Α I would agree with that. 13 0 So it could be something that you 14 would consider affordable or the public would 15 consider affordable that there might be a 16 disagreement along the lines of what I just 17 described; is that correct? 18 Α Possibly. 19 I am done with that exhibit. 0 2.0 Moving on to a few more questions, 21 if I may. 22 So Beth Kelly in her cross and in 2.3 her questions asked if there was 24 confidentiality associated with the corporate 25 financials. And you indicated that there was 26 confidentiality; is that correct? 27 On specific transactions, yes. Α 2.8 Understanding that of course Q

27

2.8

confidentiality is required in certain 1 2. circumstances, would you say that to build trust, particularly for a company that has 3 had the -- let's call it troubles that PG&E 4 5 has had, that providing as much transparency 6 is an important way to build trust? 7 Α As a public company, and as I do. a company in bankruptcy, we submit financial 9 information monthly to the Court and 10 quarterly to the financial community. 11 Given that you're looking to build 12 trust, would you say that you are bound by 13 what is legally required or that you have the 14 opportunity to go above and beyond what is 15 legally required in terms of financial 16 transparency and disclosing things to the public, to the victims, so that they get a 17 18 better sense of their investment to help 19 build trust? 2.0 А I believe transparency is important 21 in any relationship critically in which we 22 are trying to rebuild trust. That being 2.3 said, full transparency is not necessarily in 24 the stakeholders' interest. There are 25 transactions that have more consequences that we need to maintain as confidential. 26

liens currently with PG&E? What percentage?

What's the extent of the asset

| 1 | A We have very few asset liens |
|----|---|
| 2 | currently. |
| 3 | Q Can you give me a sense of |
| 4 | percentage? |
| 5 | A It's as very low percentage. We, |
| 6 | prior to the bankruptcy, issued unsecured |
| 7 | borrowing. |
| 8 | Q Prior to the bankruptcy? |
| 9 | A (Affirmative nod.) |
| 10 | Q So is it a fair statement that what |
| 11 | got the bondholders to drop their competing |
| 12 | plan was they went from unsecured investment |
| 13 | to secured investment? |
| 14 | A That was likely an element of their |
| 15 | agreement with a notable RSA. I think there |
| 16 | were a number of other reasons as well. |
| 17 | Q Was that type of security part of |
| 18 | the TCC RSA for victims? |
| 19 | A No. We did not offer sorry. |
| 20 | TCC RSA does not include debt and therefore |
| 21 | it does not include security. |
| 22 | Q So in Mr. Johnson's statement, it's |
| 23 | on the record, he stated that part of this |
| 24 | bankruptcy first priority first priority |
| 25 | was victims. Given what you've described, |
| 26 | that the noteholders, who I imagine have been |
| 27 | with PG&E for a long time, got security. I |
| 28 | sort of feel security is a good thing. And |

the TCC RSA and the victims through that 1 2. didn't get security. How is that putting the victims first? 3 I think what's important about the 4 TCC RSA, it was negotiated extensively over 5 6 months. And attorneys representing 7 70 percent of the victims felt that this was in the interest of their clients. 9 reflected what they thought was necessary to 10 satisfy their needs. This was not a 11 unilateral decision by the company. think the TCC that we were -- the TCC RSA to 12 the company was able to strike with -- allow 13 14 for more cash to be available for victims at 15 closing than the alternative. And as a 16 result of those extensive negotiations, yes, I think this is a fair outcome. 17 18 ALJ COOKE: Just as a time check, 19 Mr. Abrams, you have about five more minutes. 2.0 MR. ABRAMS: I will do my best, your 21 Honor. 22 ALJ COOKE: Might be seven minutes. BY MR. ABRAMS: 2.3 Thanks. 24 0 Earlier you stipulated 25 that the TCC RSA came first before the 26 noteholder RSA. 27 That's correct. Α 2.8 Q So the implications that you just

described about that security wasn't 1 2. something that they could move on because 3 they already inked their agreement before the noteholder RSA; is that correct? 4 5 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Asked and 6 answered. 7 ALJ COOKE: Agreed. Sustained. BY MR. ABRAMS: 8 9 I will move on. What do you know 10 about how the victims' Trust will be managed 11 as holding this 21 percent shares? 12 I think that is still being -- the 13 details are being worked out specifically, 14 but as we disclosed as part of the disclosure 15 statement, it's the intention of the Trust to 16 sell the stock of the company over time in 17 order to generate additional cash to help 18 victims rebuild. 19 So over time. So if when there's another catastrophic wildfire, let's say this 2.0 summer, would the management of this Trust 21 22 preclude them from selling off all the shares in the Trust? 2.3 24 Α The management of the Trust -- that 25 Trust Agreement, to the best of my knowledge, 26 is still being negotiated. 27 So do you stipulate that this -- I

mean this is what we are all working with,

right, is being able to provide 1 2. cross-examination on a moving plan so the 3 degree to which you can provide solid answers would really help? 4 Objection to the 5 MR. WEISSMANN: characterization, your Honor. I think he is 6 7 doing his best to answer the questions to the best of his ability. 8 9 ALJ COOKE: I am not sure there is a 10 question out there. 11 But do you agree that terms of 12 various parts of the emergence are -- from bankruptcy are still being negotiated? 13 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MR. ABRAMS: 15 16 Is your understanding that the TCC 17 RSA and how this Trust is going to be 18 managed, give me your best guess. In, as 19 these negotiations are ongoing, will these 2.0 negotiations provide the opportunity for the 21 manager of that Trust to sell those shares 22 with the next wildfire if it's this summer? | 2.3 Α These are confidential negotiations 24 that are still continuing to be worked out. 25 The intention here is to sell that stock over time in a way that maximizes value and 26 27 recovery for wildfire victims. It's still 2.8 being discussed what that looks like.

25

26

27

2.8

Thank you. Would you say that the 1 0 2. degree to which there is flexibility for that trust manager to do what they want and sell 3 when they want and buy when they want and increase the investment is to the advantage 5 of victims, and constraints on when those 6 7 sell most likely would -- to be the benefit of the other investors? 9 I would disagree with that 10 statement. I think, in part, the reason why 11 it is taking so long to negotiate is because 12 it is a complicated issue. The intention of that trust agreement is to maximize the 13 14 value, maximize the recovery. To the extent 15 that the trust was going to sell in any 16 one day 21 percent of the company, that would 17 have a significant impact on share price. 18 Providing the market with some stability as 19 to when and how those shares will be 2.0 disposed --21 0 Uh-huh. 22 -- helps support a better stock 2.3 value, and therefore, a higher recovery for 24 victims.

Q Given all these requirements that may be in this trust, do you really feel that a company that burned down your home, that affected the people who are in your

community, having them own the stock, and 1 2. then precluding them from selling the stock of the company who burned their house down --3 does that strike you as a bit unfair? 4 I don't agree with the 5 А 6 characterization, and I also don't agree that 7 that's the underlying intent. The victims themselves will not hold the stock. 8 9 stock is being held by a trust that is trying 10 to maximize recovery, and will sell that 11 stock over time so that victims can receive cash in order to help rebuild for losses 12 they've incurred. 13 14 So -- but, it's a victim trust. 15 Right? So it's the victims'. It's their 16 trust. Right? 17 Α It's set up to maximize recovery for the victims, yes. 18 19 Given this large shareholder 2.0 class -- and I want to understand the rights of that shareholder class. 21 22 Will they be able to vote based on 2.3 their 21 percent? 24 Α That's an element that can -- that 25 is continuing to be discussed. The 26 underlying stock that will be held will have 27 the same rights as all other stock issued by It will be common stock of PG&E 2.8 PG&E.

1 Corporation. 2. So they will be able to vote as a 21 percent class? 3 Subject to potential capital 4 markets limitations; but, yes. 5 ALJ COOKE: Two minutes, Mr. Abrams. 6 7 MR. ABRAMS: Thank you. What was the settlement associated 8 with the Tubbs Fire, the dollar value? 9 It was a confidential settlement. 10 Δ 11 0 So if I'm a victim of the fires, 12 and I'm being asked to vote on a plan for my financial future, I don't know the settlement 13 14 associated with the Tubbs Fire, don't know 15 the value of the shares, those are unknown 16 variables for the victims. Is that correct? The value of the shares will be 17 Α known within the fact that we currently have 18 a traded stock price. The settlement of 19 2.0 Tubbs is a confidential settlement. 21 The degree to which they can 22 understand what that means for cash in their wallet is an unknown. 2.3 Is that correct? 2.4 I believe that the plaintiffs' А 25 attornies representing the victims have and 26 will continue to provide perspective on what 27 that means for cash in the hands of -- of the victims, yes. 2.8

| 1 | Q When you say, "continue to provide |
|----|---|
| 2 | perspective," the TCC RSA precludes them from |
| 3 | providing that perspective to victims. So |
| 4 | who are they providing that perspective to? |
| 5 | A They provide it to their clients on |
| 6 | the decision to vote for the plan or not. |
| 7 | Q How can they advise their clients, |
| 8 | given the TCC RSA precludes them from doing |
| 9 | so? |
| 10 | A I don't think it precludes |
| 11 | discussing the terms of the plan of |
| 12 | reorganization and, in the opinion of their |
| 13 | attorney, why they should or shouldn't vote |
| 14 | for the plan itself. |
| 15 | Q That's an interesting opinion, |
| 16 | given the clauses in the TCC RSA, but I'll |
| 17 | leave that there. |
| 18 | After all that we've I guess |
| 19 | "discussed" is the wrong word. |
| 20 | After all that we've been |
| 21 | mentioning to date, I'd like you to think |
| 22 | about this and answer this question, if you |
| 23 | would, as a neighbor, as someone who would |
| 24 | want to provide advice to their neighbor. |
| 25 | Is this fair? |
| 26 | A I believe it is. |
| 27 | MR. ABRAMS: That's all. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Abrams. |

| 1 | Mr. Finkelstein? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. FINKELSTEIN: Thank you, your |
| 3 | Honor. |
| 4 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 5 | BY MR. FINKELSTEIN: |
| 6 | Q Good morning, Mr. Wells. I'm Bob |
| 7 | Finkelstein representing TURN. |
| 8 | A question that came to mind as |
| 9 | Mr. Abrams was asking you questions, the TCC |
| 10 | RSA, at the time that was negotiated, it's |
| 11 | correct, is it not, that the TCC was not |
| 12 | sponsoring its own proposed plan of |
| 13 | reorganization? |
| 14 | A Prior to the sign the current |
| 15 | TCC RSA, the TCC and certain ad hoc note |
| 16 | noteholders were sponsoring a separate plan |
| 17 | of reorganization. |
| 18 | Q Okay. Thank you. Let me get you |
| 19 | to well, first of all, do you have before |
| 20 | you what's been marked as TURN-X-5 and |
| 21 | TURN-X-6, which are two cross-examination |
| 22 | exhibits? |
| 23 | Your Honor, I provided you with |
| 24 | copies of these earlier, and we had sent them |
| 25 | to the service list via email at some point |
| 26 | in the last week. |
| 27 | A I have them. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |

| 1 | BY MR. FINKELSTEIN: |
|----|--|
| 2 | Q Do you recognize well, let me |
| 3 | start with TURN-X-5. |
| 4 | Do you recognize this as a PG&E |
| 5 | response to a TURN data request? |
| 6 | A Yes, I do. |
| 7 | Q And then turning to what's been |
| 8 | marked as TURN-X-6, do you recognize this |
| 9 | as the first few pages are the data |
| 10 | request itself from EPUC, followed by |
| 11 | starting at page 9 of 19, as it's designated |
| 12 | in the bottom right-hand corner, there's the |
| 13 | start of PG&E's response to that data |
| 14 | request? |
| 15 | A I see that, yes. |
| 16 | Q Yeah. And then it continues on |
| 17 | with a response to a TURN data request |
| 18 | starting at page 16 of 19 of the document? |
| 19 | A I see that, yes. |
| 20 | Q Thank you. Let me get you to turn |
| 21 | in your direct testimony in PG&E-1 to |
| 22 | page 2-22. Do you have that? |
| 23 | A I'm there, yes. |
| 24 | Q And on line 9, there's the |
| 25 | beginning of a paragraph that starts with |
| 26 | "Under PG&E's plan." Do you see that? |
| 27 | MR. WEISSMANN: Sorry. What page are |
| 28 | you on? |

```
1
           MR. FINKELSTEIN:
                              I'm sorry.
                                           Thank
 2.
     you, Mr. Weissmann.
 3
           ALJ COOKE:
                        2-23.
           MR. FINKELSTEIN:
 4
                              2-23.
 5
           MR. WEISSMANN:
                            23.
 6
           THE WITNESS: Yes, I see that.
 7
     BY MR. FINKELSTEIN:
 8
           0
               Yeah.
                       Let me make sure I can get
 9
     my bearings when I read the transcript.
10
               So on page 2-23, starting at
11
     line 9, do you see the paragraph that begins
12
     "Under PG&E's plan"?
13
           Α
               Yes.
14
               Okay. And the first sentence of
           0
15
     that paragraph describes PG&E's expectation
16
     of achieving investment grade ratings upon
17
     emergence. Do you see that?
18
           Α
               That's right.
19
               And that's sort of a -- a snapshot
           0
2.0
     at the time that the plan has been confirmed
21
     PG&E has pursued and successfully obtained
22
     the -- the financing, and at that moment, it
2.3
     will have achieved investment grade ratings.
     Is that correct?
24
25
           А
               For the secured bonds the company
26
     intends to issue.
27
               And at this point, PG&E is not
           0
2.8
     intending to issue any unsecured bonds, is
```

1 it? 2. Α That's correct. 3 0 And then the sentence that follows, beginning on line 10, describes a clear path 4 5 towards further improving its credit ratings. Do you see that? 6 7 Α I do. So for PG&E, it's not just a matter 9 of the credit ratings and its financial 10 health at the moment of emergence, but on an 11 ongoing basis thereafter? 12 Α That's correct. 13 0 Okay. Let me get you to turn, I 14 hope, to page 2-15, still in PG&E-1, and it's 15 the material that starts on line 18; again, 16 the paragraph starting, "Under PG&E's plan." 17 Do you see that? 18 Α I do. 19 So as I understand your testimony 2.0 here, there is no doubt that the \$6 billion 21 of temporary utility debt is going to be used 22 to pay wildfire claims at exit. Is that 2.3 correct? 24 Α That is correct. 25 And you go on to say on line 19 to 0 26 20, "Therefore, that debt will be the 27 financial responsibility of shareholders, not 2.8 customers"?

| 1 | A That is correct. |
|-----------|--|
| 2 | Q And the "therefore" is because it's |
| 3 fina | cing wildfire claims? |
| 4 | A The "therefore" is because it's |
| 5 debt | that does not directly finance the |
| 6 comp | ny's rate base, that it goes to |
| 7 fina | cing wildfire claims, and so there's the |
| 8 obli | ation and responsibility of shareholders |
| 9 to p | у. |
| 10 | Q And so while it is temporary |
| 11 util | ty debt, as you're describing it here, |
| 12 it w | uld be solely the responsibility of |
| 13 shar | holders. Is that a fair statement? |
| 14 | A It would be secured debt of the |
| 15 util | ty. The obligation to pay the |
| 16 assc | iated debt service would be that of |
| 17 shar | holders. |
| 18 | Q Well, not to put too fine a point |
| 19 on i | , if shareholders aren't paying it |
| 20 the | inancial cost of the debt, nobody's |
| 21 payi | g it. Is that a fair statement? |
| 22 | A It's a fair statement, but I think |
| 23 it m | scharacterizes it. I think what's |
| 24 impo | tant to look at is not |
| 25 | MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, I'm going |
| 26 to a | k that we not we save this for |
| 27 redi | ect, given the time constraints. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: I agree. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: I agree. |

MR. FINKELSTEIN: 1 Thank you. Well, let me ask it this way, 2. Mr. Wells. 3 If the utility were to default on 4 5 the temporary utility debt, the debtholders' recourse would be against the utility, not 6 7 PG&E's ratepayers. Is that a fair statement? That's correct. Α 9 And then on line 20, you describe 10 the securitization that's been a topic 11 earlier, and describe also that 12 securitization as being rate neutral. Do you 13 see that? 14 Α I see that, yes. 15 And then this -- there is a direct 16 linkage, is there not, between that 17 securitization that you're describing and the 18 temporary utility debt? 19 Α Yes. 2.0 0 Once the temporary -- and -- and 21 the proceeds of the securitization would be 22 used to retire the temporary utility debt. 2.3 Is that correct? 24 Α That's correct. 25 And once the temporary utility debt 0 is retired, it's fair to understand that 26 27 shareholders are no longer obligated for its 2.8 repayment or any financing costs associated

with that temporary utility debt? 1 Yes. It's retired. 2. Α And from that point forward, the 3 0 wildfire costs that had been the subject of 4 the temporary utility debt would now be the 5 subject of the securitization transaction? 6 7 Α Yes. 0 And as you're contemplating it under the securitization, the costs would be 9 10 collected from ratepayers through a dedicated 11 rate component? That is how we're currently 12 Α 13 contemplating it. 14 And would you agree with the characterization that the dedicated rate 15 16 component is structured in a way so as to be 17 bankruptcy-proof for any future bankruptcies? 18 А That is the intent. 19 And then at lines 24 through 27 of 2.0 2-15 of your direct testimony, you describe how PG&E intends to use certain tax benefits 21 22 and other credits to provide rate reductions. 2.3 Do you see that? 2.4 Α I do. 25 Is it PG&E's intention to structure 26 those benefits in a way so they would also be 27 bankruptcy-proof in terms of any future bankruptcy? 2.8

We're currently finalizing that 1 Α application. Our intention, though, is to 2. put forward an application that would be 3 customer protective. How it's specifically 4 5 structured, we're still working through 6 those -- those details. 7 ALJ COOKE: I have a question related to this. 8 9 When -- when you responded to 10 Mr. Finkelstein's question and the term 11 bankruptcy-proof, what does that mean to you? 12 THE WITNESS: That is a special purpose 13 entity that is outside of the legal entity 14 of -- of PG&E, that since it has a dedicated 15 rate component, legally or functionally it 16 would be separate from the utility itself. 17 And if PG&E were granted ALJ COOKE: 18 the securitization that it will be seeking at 19 some point in the future, and PG&E declared 2.0 bankruptcy again, would ratepayers still be 21 responsible for paying the non-bypassable 22 charge, as contemplated? THE WITNESS: As contemplated, 2.3 24 currently, yes, but that's why we're still 25 working through the details of the customer 26 protection for the offsetting credits. 27 ALJ COOKE: Thank you. 2.8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Thank you, your

1 Honor. Mr. Wells, let me get you to now 2. turn to what I understand has been marked as 3 PG&E-8, which I think were the 4 clarifications. 5 I have that. 6 А 7 0 I'd like to get you to turn to page 3, and at the start, you have heading 9 two, Recovery of Wildfire Claims Costs. 10 you see that? Yes. 11 Α And the last sentence of this 12 0 paragraph states: "If the Commission 13 14 approves PG&E's proposed securitization, PG&E 15 will not seek any other recovery of 2017 or 16 2018 wildfire claims costs." Do you see 17 that? 18 А That's correct. 19 And is it fair to understand "seek 2.0 any other recovery" meaning seek any other 21 rate recovery? 22 That's correct. Α 2.3 Is it reasonable to interpret this 0 24 sentence as at least implying that if the 25 Commission does not approve the 26 securitization, PG&E may seek rate recovery of 2017/2018 wildfire claims costs? 27 2.8 Α That is correct.

| 1 | Q Prior to submitting this |
|----|--|
| 2 | clarification document on Monday I'm |
| 3 | sorry, maybe Tuesday this week, do you know, |
| 4 | had had PG&E ever taken this position in |
| 5 | public? |
| 6 | A Not to my recollection, which is |
| 7 | why we wanted to clarify it for the record |
| 8 | here. |
| 9 | Q But, is it something that had been |
| 10 | understood within the company at the time |
| 11 | that you served the testimony January 31st? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | ALJ COOKE: Mr. Wells, could you point |
| 14 | me to the place in your testimony where the |
| 15 | fires covered are listed that are part of |
| 16 | that 2017 and 2018 fires? |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: Apologies. What |
| 18 | specifically are you |
| 19 | ALJ COOKE: Sorry. On page 3 |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. |
| 21 | ALJ COOKE: of Exhibit PG&E-8 where |
| 22 | Mr. Finkelstein was referring you to, PG&E's |
| 23 | plan does not address rate recovery of 2017 |
| 24 | and 2018 wildfire claims and costs, is there |
| 25 | a list somewhere in your testimony that the |
| 26 | specific fire events for 2017 and 2018 are |
| 27 | identified? |
| 28 | THE WITNESS: If I could have, just |

| 1 | very quickly |
|----|---|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 3 | (Off the record.) |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 5 | record. |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: On page 2-16 of my |
| 7 | original testimony there is a table, |
| 8 | Table 2.3, Uses. We have not broken it out. |
| 9 | But, the fire claims at the top of that |
| 10 | table, the 24.15 billion plus, as footnoted, |
| 11 | the 1.35 billion in deferred payments, that's |
| 12 | the total fire claims that is referenced |
| 13 | in on page 3 of the clarification |
| 14 | testimony. We don't have a more granular |
| 15 | breakdown of the '17 and '18 fires. |
| 16 | MR. WEISSMANN: May I interject? |
| 17 | ALJ COOKE: Mr. Weissmann. |
| 18 | MR. WEISSMANN: In the plan of |
| 19 | reorganization which has been filed with the |
| 20 | Commission, those fires are listed. |
| 21 | ALJ COOKE: Okay. |
| 22 | MR. WEISSMANN: I could give you a |
| 23 | particular page, if that would be helpful. |
| 24 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Why don't we do |
| 25 | that after lunch? |
| 26 | MR. WEISSMANN: Thank you. |
| 27 | MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, is it |
| 28 | back to me? |

2.8

1 ALJ COOKE: Yes. Sorry. MR. FINKELSTEIN: Thank you. Mr. Wells, let me get you to turn 3 0 in your direct testimony, PG&E-1, page 2-22, 4 line -- it's the sentence that starts on line 5 21. 6 Do you see that? 7 Α I do. And you see that it states: "PG&E 9 is not requesting that the wildfire claims be recovered from customers, and those amounts 10 11 would ultimately be paid by shareholders, even if initially financed with debt in whole 12 or in part." Do you see that? 13 14 Α I do. 15 Would you agree that that's no 16 longer true, given PG&E's position taken in the clarification that if it does not obtain 17 18 securitization, it may seek rate recovery of 19 the costs of those claims? 2.0 А No, not exactly. We haven't taken 21 a position one way or the other if 22 securitization is denied. We're withholding that evaluation. 2.3 24 But, you are holding on to the Q 25 possibility that you might seek rate 26 recovery, should securitization be denied? 27 We are currently, as part of this

application, not seeking recovery for those

2.8

claims costs from customers. 1 2. So based on this app- -- based on this investigation and PG&E's testimony 3 submitted, to date, and the clarifications 4 and things of that nature, the Commission can 5 6 conclude safely that PG&E is not at this time 7 seeking rate recovery for 2017 and 2018 wildfire costs. Is that correct? I'm sorry, 8 wildfire claims costs. Is that correct? 9 10 Α As part of this plan, we are not 11 seeking recovery for 2017, 2018 wildfires 12 claims costs. 13 But, at some point going forward 14 that may change, and PG&E could then seek 15 rate recovery of claims costs associated with 16 the 2017 and 2018 wildfires? 17 Α That's correct. 18 And Mr. Wells, just for 0 19 clarification, we keep talking about 2017 and 2018 wildfires. Does -- does that figure 2.0 also include costs associated with the 2015 21 22 Butte, B-u-t-t-e, Fire? It does include a little bit 2.3 Δ 2.4 related to the Butte Fire in 2015. 25 And when you say, "a little bit," 26 do you have order of magnitude what a little 27 bit is in this context? A few hundred million. Α

And for the Butte wildfire, if you 1 2. know, would that be the amount of wildfire claims costs that exceeded the available 3 liability insurance proceeds? 4 We didn't --5 А 6 0 If you know. 7 Α The agreement wasn't structured in a way to resolve each of those individual 9 It was resolving the collection of 10 fires. So it -- I don't have the ability to answer that directly. 11 And could you hopefully very 12 briefly describe how 2019 wildfire claims 13 14 costs are treated in your bankruptcy plan, 15 your plan of reorganization? 16 Α They're currently not addressed 17 here. 18 So those -- those claims -- it's 19 correct to understand those claims would not 2.0 be discharged if your proposed plan of 21 reorganization gets confirmed? 22 Α Currently, we don't know the cause 2.3 and origin or -- of the 2019 fires, so we are 24 not proposing any payment of claims as part 25 of this plan of reorganization. 26 But, you are, are you not, 27 proposing payment of claims associated with the Tubbs Fire? 2.8

| A Sorry. I thought you said, "2019." |
|--|
| Q I'm sorry. I'm switching now from |
| your previous response to the treatment of |
| the Tubbs Fire under the proposed plan of |
| reorganization. |
| Does the proposed plan of |
| reorganization include costs of claims |
| associated with the Tubbs Fire? |
| A No. |
| Q Okay. Let me get you to turn to |
| what's been marked as PG&E-13, which is a |
| document that was financial projections. |
| A I have that document. |
| Q Well, I don't, so hold on a second, |
| Mr. Wells. |
| ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| (Off the record.) |
| ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. |
| BY MR. FINKELSTEIN: |
| Q So Mr. Wells, PG&E-13, the first |
| page of text simply has the heading "Exhibit |
| 'B,' Financial Projections." Do you see |
| that? |
| A I see that. |
| Q Can you briefly describe what this |
| document is that there are financial |
| projections for what purpose? |
| A Under the bankruptcy court, as part |
| |

of the required disclosures statement that is 1 2. used to evaluate and vote on the plan of reorganization, the company's required to put 3 together financial projections supporting its 4 ability to maintain financial health post 5 6 emergence. This document addresses that. 7 And in -- this document was issued on February 18th of this year. Is that 8 9 correct? Δ I believe that's the -- the case. 10 11 O On page 5 of this document, there 12 is several bullet points toward the top of 13 the page. Do you see that? 14 Α I do. 15 In the last bullet point before the 16 heading "Financing Considerations," it starts off "Wildfires OII." Do you see that? 17 18 Α Yes. 19 And the last sentence states: "The 2.0 consolidated financial projections assume that these costs will not be recovered." 21 22 you see that? I do. 2.3 Α 24 And when you -- when PG&E says, "will not be recovered" in this context, is 25 it will not be recovered in rates? 26 27 Α That's correct. And then on page 6 of the same 2.8 Q

document, Mr. Wells, the bullet -- second to 1 2. the last bullet point on this page about restoring common dividends, do you see this? 3 Α I do. 4 And it seems to be tied to 5 6 achieving a certain equity ratio, and then 7 you use the phrase -- or PG&E uses the phrase "on a regulatory basis." Do you see that? 8 9 Α I do. In this context, does "on a 10 0 11 regulatory basis" mean with the various 12 adjustments that you've described in your direct testimony here? 13 14 Α That is correct. 15 Are there any adjustments being 16 made to the calculation of the equity ratio other than the ones that you've described in 17 18 your testimony here, to your knowledge? 19 Not that I'm aware of. Α 2.0 0 Let me get you to turn, please, to what's been marked as PG&E-12. No. 21 sorry, still on PG&E-13, the consolidated --22 2.3 the financial projections document in 24 PG&E-13. 25 Uh-huh. А 26 On page 9 of that document, there's 27 a consolidated cash flow table? 28 Α Yes.

| 1 | Q I'm sorry. The first line of the |
|----|--|
| 2 | table itself says, "Cash Flow Statement." Do |
| 3 | you see that? |
| 4 | A I do. |
| 5 | Q And then the bottom of the first |
| 6 | section has a net cash from operations |
| 7 | figure. Is that correct? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q And it reflects, if I'm reading |
| 10 | correctly, an increase from \$5.8 billion in |
| 11 | 2022 to approximately \$7.9 billion in 2024? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q Now let me get you to turn, please, |
| 14 | to what has been marked as PG&E-12. And that |
| 15 | is a set of slides, the first page of which |
| 16 | says, PG&E Business Outlook. Do you have |
| 17 | that? |
| 18 | A I have that. |
| 19 | Q Let me get you to turn to Slide 34 |
| 20 | of this document. Do you have that? |
| 21 | A I have it. |
| 22 | Q At the very top of the page it |
| 23 | says, Sustainable Financials, is part of the |
| 24 | heading. Do you see that? |
| 25 | A Yes. |
| 26 | Q So in the left-hand column there is |
| 27 | what looks to be a label of sorts of noncore |
| 28 | earnings factors. Do you see that? |

| 1 | A I do. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q And then there are, appears to me, |
| 3 | to be five listed here on this slide. Is |
| 4 | that the correct way to interpret this slide? |
| 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | Q Just in general, what are the |
| 7 | noncore earning factors trying to identify in |
| 8 | this context? |
| 9 | A These are transactions that are |
| 10 | flowing through our financial projects that |
| 11 | we don't think are reflective of the ongoing |
| 12 | earnings power of the company. We are trying |
| 13 | to highlight them separately for investors. |
| 14 | Q In each of the five cases you |
| 15 | listed here, five examples you listed here, |
| 16 | are they costs that the utility anticipates |
| 17 | incurring sort of on a one-affiliate basis, |
| 18 | and doesn't expect to reflect what costs the |
| 19 | utility will incur on a going-forward basis? |
| 20 | A That is basically yes. |
| 21 | Q The next page is Slide 35 of what |
| 22 | has been marked as PG&E-12. Do you have |
| 23 | that? |
| 24 | A I have it. |
| 25 | Q And the title here is Cost Savings |
| 26 | Areas of Focus; is that correct? |
| 27 | A Yes. |
| 28 | Q Am I correct in understanding |

well, it says it at the very top, identify an 1 2. average of \$1 billion per year in operational costs through 2025. Do you see that? 3 Α I do. 4 That is average \$1 billion per year 5 0 6 that PG&E expects to cut from operational 7 costs? That are reflected in our operating 8 9 plan, yes. 10 And then the next sentence says 0 11 that it will moderate -- such savings would 12 moderate the expected increase on customer 13 bills to support infrastructure investment. 14 Do you see that? 15 That's correct. Δ 16 And that increases on the bills, 0 17 separate and apart of any treatment of 18 wildfire claims costs. These are the costs 19 of infrastructure for the Wildfire Mitigation 2.0 Plan, things that natural? 21 А That is correct. 22 Would you agree with me that the 2.3 savings would only serve that purpose to the 24 extent they show up in the authorized revenue 25 requirement? 26 Α Not necessarily. 27 Until they show up in the 2.8 authorized revenue requirement, how do they

2.0

2.3

2.8

moderate the expected increase on customer bills?

A In some cases this is -- avoids costs that would have otherwise flowed into the authorized revenue requirement.

Q So where the revenue requirement is set on a recorded cost basis, you are suggesting that there would be a lower amount of recorded costs that PG&E would ultimately seek rate recovery of; is that correct?

A May I briefly expand?

Q If it is real brief, Mr. Wells.

A The time we put together our rate cases, we have seen additional costs come into our forecast for things like the passage of Senate Bill 247. We want to minimize the impact of the -- any way, we've seen cost increases that were otherwise eligible to track in either memorandum accounts or balancing accounts to seek recovery at a later date. These cost savings are intended to execute that work more efficiently so we can reduce what would be that forecasted impact on future rates.

Q To your knowledge, as you sit here today, would these cost savings be entirely in programs that are subject to rate recovery on a recorded cost basis, or would any of

them be in programs that are subject to rate 1 recovery on a forecast basis? 2. 3 Some of them are, both. Would you agree with me that to the 4 0 5 extent they are for programs that are recovered on a forecast basis, that cost 6 7 savings, until there is an adjustment in the revenue requirement, flow to the utility 9 rather than to its ratepayers? 10 Δ Yes. 11 0 Let me get you to turn back to what 12 has been marked as PG&E-13, which is the 13 financial projections document we were 14 talking about a second ago. 15 I have it. Α 16 The very last page. Q 17 Α Yes. So on this table, the net cash from 18 0 operations that is listed here, would these 19 2.0 figures reflect the cost savings we were just talking about a second ago from attachment --21 22 I'm sorry, from what has been marked as 2.3 PG&E-12? 24 Α They do. 25 Then, I'm sorry to keep asking you 0 26 to bounce back and forth, Mr. Wells, back to 27 Exhibit 12, if you could. 2.8 Α I've got it.

| 1 | Q And Slide 29. |
|----|--|
| 2 | A I'm there. |
| 3 | Q This was I think Ms. Kelly asked |
| 4 | you some questions about the PG&E forecast |
| 5 | for rate case growth of 8 percent per year. |
| 6 | Do you recall those questions? |
| 7 | A I do. |
| 8 | Q For these historical figures that |
| 9 | are shown in the first column on this graph, |
| 10 | I'm sorry, let me ask for both. Is this just |
| 11 | electric operations or does it include all |
| 12 | operations? |
| 13 | A All operations. |
| 14 | Q Okay. For the historical figures, |
| 15 | would it include disallowed capital |
| 16 | expenditures? Are those excluded from this? |
| 17 | A That would be excluded from this. |
| 18 | Q Let me ask you let me ask you to |
| 19 | look at what has been marked as TURN-X-5, |
| 20 | which is Response to TURN Data Request, |
| 21 | Question 5. Do you see that? |
| 22 | A I'm turning to it. I have it. |
| 23 | Q And this was a data request that |
| 24 | asked PG&E to provide its best current |
| 25 | estimate of the cost of financing and |
| 26 | financial advisor fees. Do you see that? It |
| 27 | is on the second page of text. It is |
| 28 | designated page 4 in the bottom right-hand |

| 1 | corner. |
|--|---|
| 2 | A Which question is that? |
| 3 | Q I'm sorry, it is Question 5. |
| 4 | A I'm there. |
| 5 | Q And then part of what PG&E provided |
| 6 | in response is this table that is attached as |
| 7 | the last page of the document; is that |
| 8 | correct? |
| 9 | A That is correct. |
| 10 | Q And this is, by the heading, a |
| 11 | Summary of Professional Fees and Expenses. |
| 12 | Do you see that? |
| 13 | A I do. |
| 14 | Q And it states at the top that it is |
| | |
| 15 | a summary as of January 29th, 2020. Do you |
| 15 16 | a summary as of January 29th, 2020. Do you see that? |
| | - |
| 16 | see that? |
| 16 17 | see that? A I do. |
| 16 17 18 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a |
| 16 17 18 19 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, their submissions for compensation or |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, their submissions for compensation or reimbursement had not been kept "current," |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, their submissions for compensation or reimbursement had not been kept "current," for a lack of a more precise term? |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, their submissions for compensation or reimbursement had not been kept "current," for a lack of a more precise term? A It is possible. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, their submissions for compensation or reimbursement had not been kept "current," for a lack of a more precise term? A It is possible. Q So the first one is Kravath, |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | see that? A I do. Q Would you agree with me that for a number of these firms that are listed here, their submissions for compensation or reimbursement had not been kept "current," for a lack of a more precise term? A It is possible. Q So the first one is Kravath, K-r-a-v-a-t-h, Swaine, S-w-a-i-n-e. Do you |

attorney firms that PG&E holding company is 1 2. relying on? 3 Α That is correct, yes. And it shows that the figure that 4 0 is listed here was only for submissions 5 6 through September 30th, 2019? 7 Α Yes. So it would be reasonable to 0 9 conclude that the actual amounts of 10 professional fees through January 29th is 11 likely to be somewhat higher than the figures that are listed on this table? 12 That is correct. 13 Α 14 And then for financing fees and 15 such, is it correct to understand that those 16 fees will, for the most part, be incurred 17 later in the process, closer to when PG&E 18 emerges from bankruptcy? 19 A large percentage of those fees 2.0 have been incurred, have been set, not paid. 21 As part of the noteholder RSA, the remainder 22 will be incurred as part of the exit. 2.3 So when you say "set," if the 0 24 Commission were to ask you what is the 25 current amount that PG&E has paid for such financing fees, if they've been set, does 26 27 that necessarily mean they've been paid to

this point or they will be paid at some point

2.8

2.8

in the future? 1 2. They will be paid at exit, but we know the amount. 3 So then it sounds to me, Mr. Wells, 4 5 there are three categories. There is a category that have been incurred and paid, 6 7 there is a category that have been set but not yet paid and then there is a third 9 category that has not yet been set and not 10 yet paid. Is that a fair characterization? 11 Α That is correct. 12 0 Okay. Is it fair to understand 13 that the majority of the financing-related 14 costs would fall into the latter two 15 categories that is either set but not yet 16 paid or not yet set and not yet paid? 17 Α That is correct. 18 Then, as I understand PG&E's 0 19 position, it is that it is only seeking 2.0 recovery of -- and I apologize for not having 21 the figure at hand, Mr. Wells -- something in 22 the range of \$150 million of financing fees? Just a little bit more than that, 2.3 Α yes, 154 million. 24 25 0 Thank you. 26 Is PG&E committing at this time 27 that it is -- that is it. It is for financing fees, it would be \$154 million and

absolutely nothing else no matter what? 1 2. Α No. That is our current estimate. Well, for the fees that recovered 3 0 by the current estimate, whatever the final 4 amount turns out to be for that subset of 5 6 fees, is PG&E committing now that it is only 7 that subset, fees that have been identified as now being \$154 million, whatever that 8 9 figure proves to be, that would be the 10 entirety of what PG&E ever seeks to recover 11 from ratepayers for financing costs? 12 We are seeking to clarify that we 13 intend to recover those categories of 14 financing costs. Our current estimate is 154 15 million. 16 And that category of financing 0 17 costs, as I understand it, are the financing 18 costs associated with a subset of the total 19 financing transactions that PG&E contemplates 2.0 for its plan of reorganization? 21 The subset related to costs that Α 22 are used to fund the company's rate base, 2.3 It is a subset of the total financing. 24 Okay. Other than that subset, is O 25 PG&E taking the position now for all the 26 other categories of financing it is never 27 going to seek rate recovery for those costs? 2.8 We are not -- yes. We are trying Α

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

to clarify that we are not intending to seek rate recovery for the professional fees, the financing costs that are not associated with funding rate base.

Q And your use of the term
"intending" gives me the heebie-jeebies, to
use a technical term, Mr. Wells. Can the
Commission take that to the bank and say the
utility is never going to seek it? Or is it
based on what PG&E knows today it doesn't
intend to seek it, or things can change and
we might seek it later?

A We are not seeking recovery for these costs.

Q At this time as part of the material that you've submitted in this investigation; is that correct?

A It would be easier if we went line by line. We are not in -- we are not going to seek recovery for the professional costs associated with the bankruptcy, except for the professional costs that were associated with the RSA. We are not going to seek recovery now or in the future for the financing costs associated with the financing that does not fund rate base. We do intend to seek recovery for the financing costs that are used to support the funding of rate base.

| 1 | Q And those are the amounts that |
|----|---|
| 2 | you've been characterizing as being offset by |
| 3 | interest rate savings in your testimony and |
| 4 | other places; is that correct? |
| 5 | A That last category, yes. |
| 6 | MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can I |
| 7 | have one second off the record? |
| 8 | ALJ COOKE: Off the record. |
| 9 | (Off the record.) |
| 10 | ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. |
| 11 | MR. FINKELSTEIN: Mr. Wells, that is |
| 12 | all I have. Thank you for your patience. |
| 13 | Thank you, your Honor. |
| 14 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 15 | Let's be off the record. |
| 16 | (Off the record.) |
| 17 | ALJ COOKE: We will be back on the |
| 18 | record. |
| 19 | Mr. Alcantar, proceed. |
| 20 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 21 | BY MR. ALCANTAR: |
| 22 | Q Mr. Wells, good afternoon, barely. |
| 23 | My name is Michael Alcantar. I represent the |
| 24 | Energy Producers and Users Coalition and the |
| 25 | Indicated Shippers in this proceeding. |
| 26 | Let me start with exactly who you |
| 27 | work for. Is it the utility, the |
| 28 | corporation, the holding company corporation, |

| 1 | or both? |
|----|---|
| 2 | A I work for the corporation. |
| 3 | Q Okay. There is, in your |
| 4 | estimation, a direct link, is there not, |
| 5 | between the debt status, if you will, of the |
| 6 | corporation and the utility? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q So in that event, if the |
| 9 | corporation were to take on greater debt, |
| 10 | that would have an impact upon the utility's |
| 11 | capacity and rate with respect to other debt? |
| 12 | A It could at certain thresholds. |
| 13 | Q Okay. I want to go through |
| 14 | hopefully a quick process of chronological |
| 15 | check of where credit ratings were and where |
| 16 | they've come. Is it correct that PG&E's |
| 17 | credit rating progressive declined from A- |
| 18 | rating at the end of 2017 to BBB |
| 19 | through 2018? |
| 20 | A That is correct. |
| 21 | Q The BBB rating is below investment |
| 22 | grade, as we've established; correct? |
| 23 | A BBB is investment grade. It is not |
| 24 | below. |
| 25 | Q Okay. When PG&E filed for |
| 26 | bankruptcy in January of 2019, was it at a |
| 27 | BBB rating or lower? |
| 28 | A The rating agency evaporated us to |

| 1 | sub-investment grade. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q Which was? |
| 3 | A I don't recall the specific rating, |
| 4 | but it was below investment grade before we |
| 5 | filed for bankruptcy. |
| 6 | Q Below BBB? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q Okay. This credit rating drop in |
| 9 | 2018 created financial distress for PG&E |
| 10 | during 2018. Is that fair to say? |
| 11 | A Apologies. We were downgraded from |
| 12 | investment grade in 2019. We maintained an |
| 13 | investment grade rating throughout 2018. We |
| 14 | experienced the most acute financial changes |
| 15 | after the Camp Fire, late 2018 and early |
| 16 | 2019. |
| 17 | Q My question is a little more broad. |
| 18 | You were on a stress decline, is what I'm |
| 19 | trying to get to; is that fair? |
| 20 | A That is correct. |
| 21 | Q You would agree, would you not, |
| 22 | that the 2018 and 2019 credit ratings drop |
| 23 | and financial distress was caused by wildfire |
| 24 | damage claims adverse to PG&E relating to |
| 25 | 2017 and 2018 events? |
| 26 | A Largely. |
| 27 | Q In PG&E's publicly available |
| 28 | announcement to investors at the end of 2018, |

2.8

beginning of 2019, the stated reason for the 1 2. January 29th bankruptcy filing was a result of wildfire damage claims; is that correct? 3 Д That is correct. 4 In the financial markets, 5 0 Yeah. 6 based upon your experience, is it fair to say 7 that interest rates for utility with a BBB or lower rating will be higher than the interest 8 9 rate for a utility with A- bond rate? 10 Α That is right. In your historical time horizon of 11 0 12 reviewing credit ratings, and bond ratings in 13 particular, are you aware of an interest rate 14 spread reflecting a difference in bond 15 ratings that did not exist in terms of this 16 kind of correlation between credit rating and 17 on ready? 18 А I'm not aware. 19 You would agree, would you not, 2.0 that PG&E's costs of selling new bonds and 21 refinancing existing bonds will be at a 22 higher interest rate if PG&E's bond rating is 2.3 a BBB in comparison to a PG&E bond rating of 24 A-? 25 Α Yes. 26 I think we've established this, but 27 I want to make sure, just in this chronology,

in 2017 when PG&E had an A- bond rating, PG&E

did not issue secured debt; correct? 1 That is correct. 2. Α It did issue unsecured debt during 3 0 that period; is that also correct? 4 That is right. 5 Α 6 0 Is it correct to say, and I'll open 7 this up to you if you disagree, is it correct to say that PG&E can only issue secured debt 9 in an amount limited by the market value of 10 its property that can be mortgaged? 11 Α Generally, yes. 12 I would like you to turn with me 13 briefly to your PG&E-1 testimony, original 14 testimony, at page 2 dash... 15 I'm sorry, 2-dash? Α 16 Sorry about that, 2-12. And I'm 0 17 focused on lines beginning 15 and extending 18 through 18, for a couple of reasons. One is 19 I am very much interested in understanding 2.0 your definition, complete definition in as 21 much detail as possible, of the term "utility 22 contributions" as it is used at line 17. 2.3 For example, you just described, 24 before I started questioning you, utility 25 contributions associated with bankruptcy Those will come from shareholders and 26 fees. 27 not from ratepayers. Those are the kinds of 2.8 things I'm interested in making sure I

understand your full list of what is and 1 2. isn't a utility contribution? 3 А This testimony here relates specifically to the payment to the state's 4 5 wildfire fund. So it is not trying to refer any broader to determine contribution. 6 7 our payment or contribution to the AB 1054 wildfire fund. 8 9 There also embedded in this passage 10 is a reflection of your understanding of the 11 obligations of AB 1054; is that fair? That is fair. 12 Α 13 0 You've studied that carefully, have 14 you not? 15 Α I have. 16 Q As a ratepayer -- are you a ratepayer of PG&E? 17 18 Α I am. 19 I am as well. As a ratepayer of 2.0 PG&E, you would agree, would you not, that 21 every ratepayer has an acute interest in 22 preserving the protections that they thought 2.3 they had under state law with respect to AB 24 1054? 25 I'm not sure I understand the А 26 question. 27 There are protections in AB 1054 2.8 that accrue to ratepayers in terms of the

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

amount they might bear from the bankruptcy or from the wildfires; correct?

- A I understand that limitation, yes.
- Q And there is an interest in these ratepayers knowing with clarity and with as much specificity as possible exactly what those limitations are. Is that a fair statement?
 - A I think that is, yes.
- Q There is also an interest in this Commission who has an obligation to protect ratepayers and to implement effectively AB 1054 protections. Would you agree with that statement?
 - A Yes, I do.
- Q So what is vitally important to me, and I'll try to cut to the chase as best we can to see if we can cut some of these out, is your plan is a plan. It has intentions. It has hopes. It has some expectations. There are places where it is hard to find, as I think you were here for Mr. Johnson's testimony, the term commitments and assurances and enforceability, if you will, process or triggers that this Commission could employ in a timely way to ensure those protections under 1054 are both understood and timely enforced. Is that a fair

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

characterization of your description of the PG&E plan?

A Well, we are seeking to clarify our intentions under this plan. Because we understand the point that you raise, which is why we filed that supplemental testimony this week.

Q And that is PG&E-8, you are referring to the supplemental testimony. I'm sorry, PG&E-7 is your supplemental testimony.

In PG&E-8, if I can get you to refer to that, there are several paragraphs there that I think your CEO passed along to you as something you would be responsible for. And your counsel was careful with me to make sure that I didn't exclusively rely on Mr. Johnson's testimony, but made sure I asked you these questions.

This is your effort to clarify what is now a different position from what was filed by PG&E on the 31st of January in terms of issues associated with wildfire costs, and fees, and bankruptcy fees, professional fees and debt-carrying costs incurred that you will not be seeking recovery from ratepayers; correct?

A I wouldn't characterize that as a change of position. What we are trying to do

26

27

2.8

is provide further clarity, because we 1 2. recognize that the original testimony was unclear in some of these areas. 3 Fair point. 4 0 Okay. Are there standards in the plan to 5 6 assure for the Commission that they will have 7 the opportunity, and for ratepayers, that they will have the opportunity in advance of costs being incurred or allocated to them 10 under your plan that preserve these 11 protections that we've been alluding to? 12 That is what we are seeking to 13 support by providing this clarity. 14 But there isn't, as I've seen, and 15 that is what I'm trying to clarify with you, there isn't a: Dear Commission, here is the 16 17 process questions, process that you should go 18 through Tier 3 advice letter filings that we 19 will submit; here are the areas that you 2.0 should be sensitive to in terms of what 21 standards would trigger a 22 different-than-expected result. We tried to articulate that. 2.3 Д 24

A We tried to articulate that. I think it is -- we've committed to advice letter process to true-up our cost of debt to be reflective of savings we've anticipated, as well as the financing costs that we forecasted.

We have identified the separate 1 2 application for securitization, which is not 3 a component of this plan. But as we referenced, if unapproved, we will have to 4 evaluate at that time whether or not the 5 6 company will seek going forward from there 7 any cost recovery related to 2017 and 2018 So what we have tried to do is 8 9 clarify each of those points. 1 10 0 In the event the Commission Okay. 11 makes different assessments of the baseline 12 under 1054 -- AB 1054, than your testimony 13 and the corrections in supplemental testimony 14 seeks to justify, will your plan be withdrawn? 15 16 It's hard to speculate as to how 17 would we address those issues. We've tried 18 to be very forthcoming but for a plan that on 19 our basis of our understanding of the 2.0 baseline results in a net decrease for 21 customer rates. Obviously we want to work 22 with the Commission to incorporate feedback, 2.3 but it's hard to speculate until I understand 24 specifically what that feedback is. 25 There's risk in your plan, is there 26 not? 27 Α I think there is risk in all financial projections. 2.8

That's exactly fair. 1 0 Of course. 2. And there's risk for ratepayers if your 3 projections are wrong, correct? Д That's correct. 4 5 And if ratepayers sought relief 6 from a risk that went awry or a projection 7 that went awry that resulted in harm to them, they would need to seek recovery through a 8 9 Commission process; is that correct, in your 10 understanding? 11 Α I don't know the procedural 12 mechanism to seek recovery. 13 Would you expect ratepayers to have 14 some other action against PG&E directly if 15 your plan goes awry? 16 I want to be responsive. I am Α struggling with "plan goes awry." I think we 17 18 -- I will acknowledge that plans are a 19 projection of the future. There is risk to 2.0 that, but we have taken a number of steps to 21 feel confident in this plan. 22 And I want to endorse your 2.3 confidence. I want it all to come together. 24 Unfortunately, we live in a world that 25 doesn't accept that as reality. So if you 26 look at a future that bears risk and you're 27 looking at a Commission that needs to try to 2.8 assess that risk and act upon those risks

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

failing to meet standards that are enforceable and identified, which is as you know, akin to what the governor seems to be saying to PG&E as well.

just what process you see and what guidance you would suggest for this Commission about the standards it should be concerned with and whether or not there are commitments in this plan that if there's a failure of those future forecast projections and injuries result, harm results, what will they do? How will they act and how will they act in a timely way? It's a compound question and I'm sorry, but I'm trying to move along here.

A The basis of the majority of these financial projections are rate cases that either have been decided or settled. So we have a great deal of visibility under these financial plans. To the extent that adverse actions were to occur, I think these adverse actions would likely accrue more to shareholders than they would customers because these plans are based again on either subtle rate bases or decided rate cases.

Q Again, I accept your hope and I accept your dream. I guess that you're being asked to speak into the mic. I accept your

hope and I accept your optimism. I am really 1 2. not challenging that. What I am asking about is unfortunately plans go awry. That's 3 really the scenario I am trying to drill down 4 5 on. 6 ALJ COOKE: Can you ask a more specific 7 question? I don't know that he's going to be able to answer. That is the third time. 8 9 MR. ALCANTAR: Fair point. 10 And, Mr. Wells, if you tip ALJ COOKE: 11 your microphone up a little it might be 12 better. 13 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 14 BY MR. ALCANTAR: 15 There was, as you have alluded to, 16 a change or a correction or an updating of 17 views regarding the pass-through of costs to 18 ratepayers concerning wildfires in 2017 and 19 '18 and part of 2015, as well as the 20 professional fees associated with bankruptcy. 21 What was it that caused you to change your 22 earlier-expressed position that PG&E was not 2.3 taking a position on the treatment of those 24 costs? 25 А It was an understanding in the lack 26 of clarity how important timeliness of this 27 entire proceeding is in wanting to be as

clear as possible with arguments in this

proceeding.

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

Q Were there principles involved in terms of your interpretation of 1054?

A Yes.

Q And what were the changes in those principles that might be instructed to this Commission about your interpretation?

A I don't think there's ever been a change in principle. Our basic premise with respect to AB 1054 and the customer's protection is that that protection addressed the costs directly associated with this plan of reorganization. And as a result, that's why we try to clarify we are incurring financing costs that we intend to seek recovery for that will be offset by interest rate savings and that the other professional services costs, the other financing costs for non-rate-base-funded debt and equity would be covered by shareholders.

Q Let me step into the assumptions -the assumption world about the securitized
debt that you're looking forward to making an
application for. And let's assume that those
projections also don't exactly match
expectations, and instead of being a rate
reduction, actually work adversely in terms
of rates for ratepayers.

Is there any basis, if that event 1 would occur, that this Commission should not 2. assure that PG&E is not issuing any dividends 3 to any shareholder during that period of 4 time? 5 We intend to offer specificity 6 7 around the customer protections in the upcoming application. As it relates to 8 9 restrictions on dividends, I think that that 10 would complicate what will be a record 11 capital raise post-emergence. I don't think 12 that is in stakeholders' interest, customers, shareholders, wildfire victims, all 13 14 shareholders as part of this case. 15 Would you agree that paying off 16 that debt as quickly as conceivably possible is in everyone's interests? 17 18 MR. WEISSMANN: Sorry. What debt are 19 you referring to? 2.0 BY MR. ALCANTAR: Securitization. Our plan doesn't 21 Α 22 require securitization. So, it's hard to 2.3 directly answer that question. 24 I am looking towards the 0 Yes. 25 future you have described for us about --26 excuse me -- the securitization plan that is 27 also coming. 2.8 Α Yeah.

In that plan, I'm exploring is 1 2. whether or not -- what are the ratepayer 3 protection concepts that you're working on for that? 4 Subject to continued changes, we 5 А 6 finalized our application. We have 7 considered the opportunity at, or general rate cases, to include a review of the 9 customer credits to ensure that on the 10 present value basis those customer credits 11 still result in a rate-neutral 12 securitization. Okay. What about a principle that 13 14 would -- if you don't like the idea of 15 withholding dividends, what about a principle 16 that would require the repayment of that 17 securitization debt until you have reached a 18 pre 19 -- pre-2017 A1 credit rating? 19 I think any additional restrictions 2.0 are going to complicate what is already going 21 to be a very complicated capital *rates. 22 think it's unfair to look at the credit 2.3 rating prior to 2017 because since then it's 24 not just the company's actions that have 25 impacted the company's credit ratings, it's 26 also the qualitative concerns around the 27 business environment.

I have nothing further,

MR. ALCANTAR:

| 1 | your Honor. Thank you, Mr. Wells. |
|----|--|
| 2 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 3 | Mr. Miley. |
| 4 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 5 | BY MR. MILEY: |
| 6 | Q Good afternoon, your Honor and |
| 7 | Mr. Wells. |
| 8 | My name is Matt Miley with the |
| 9 | Public Advocates Office. |
| 10 | A Good afternoon. |
| 11 | Q Just a short line of questions for |
| 12 | you today. |
| 13 | Do you have access to Chapter 7? |
| 14 | This would be PG&E Chapter 7. That's the |
| 15 | testimony sponsored by John Lowe. Do you |
| 16 | have that in front of you? |
| 17 | A I don't have that in front of me. |
| 18 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 19 | (Off the record.) |
| 20 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 21 | record. |
| 22 | While we were off the record, we |
| 23 | clarified this is in PG&E-1, Chapter 7, |
| 24 | Mr. John Lowe's testimony. Off the record. |
| 25 | (Off the record.) |
| 26 | ALJ COOKE: Back on the record. |
| 27 | Mr. Miley. |
| 28 | BY MR. MILEY: |

| 1 | Q Mr. Wells, if you could please turn |
|----|--|
| 2 | to page 7-15 of PG&E-1? |
| 3 | A I have turned there. |
| 4 | Q Thank you. So for context, this |
| 5 | section what we're looking at is under the |
| 6 | overall heading of Executive Compensation |
| 7 | Structure. So I would like to point you |
| 8 | please, to about two-thirds of the way down |
| 9 | the page, there's a heading titled Long-Term |
| 10 | Incentive Plan. Do you see that? |
| 11 | A I see that. |
| 12 | Q Beginning on line 23, Mr. Lowe's |
| 13 | testimony states: |
| 14 | Long-term incentive plan |
| 15 | awards for 2020 |
| 16 | post-emergence will consist |
| 17 | entirely of performance |
| 18 | shares that will be awarded |
| 19 | only upon achievement of |
| 20 | the objective performance |
| 21 | metrics described below, |
| 22 | with the proviso that such |
| 23 | awards must be held for at |
| 24 | least three years from the |
| 25 | grant date. |
| 26 | There's a footnote there, Footnote |
| 27 | 18. That footnote reads: |
| 28 | The CEO's compensation |

| 1 | structure currently also |
|----|---|
| 2 | includes stock options. |
| 3 | Do you see that, Mr. Wells? |
| 4 | A I do. |
| 5 | Q Mr. Wells, could you please |
| 6 | describe your involvement or contribution, if |
| 7 | any, in developing the CEO stock option |
| 8 | exercise prices, the quantity of stocks, or |
| 9 | the corresponding expiration dates associated |
| 10 | with those shares? |
| 11 | A I was not involved in any of that |
| 12 | compensation package. |
| 13 | Q Is the compensation package |
| 14 | something that would have come across your |
| 15 | desk or something you would have reviewed at |
| 16 | all before it was presented, regardless of |
| 17 | development? |
| 18 | I guess what I'm asking is would |
| 19 | you say that you have any influence over that |
| 20 | structure of the development? |
| 21 | A I do not, no, have any influence. |
| 22 | MR. MILEY: No further questions. |
| 23 | Thank you, Mrs. Wells. Thank you, your |
| 24 | Honor. |
| 25 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |
| 26 | Let's be off the record. |
| 27 | (Off the record.) |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Let's be back |

1 on the record. At this time, Commissioner 2. Rechtschaffen has some questions. Make sure 3 your microphone is on. 4 5 EXAMINATION 6 BY COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: 7 Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Wells. Sorry I had a -- was unable to 9 hear your entire testimony this morning. 10 I want to ask you first a question 11 that President Batjer asked Mr. Plaster two 12 days ago and I don't know if you were here for that or not. 13 14 Α I was not, but I heard. 15 0 And he reserved it for you. 16 Α Yes. 17 The question is: What happens if 0 18 it turns out that PG&E's undercapitalized as a result of the plan? What are its options 19 2.0 going forward? 21 We've worked extensively with 22 financial market participants to ensure we 2.3 are putting forward a plan that is not undercapitalized. To the extent that 24 25 concerns are under a capitalizational raise, 26 it would be our intention to continue to work 27 with all stakeholders in the case to address

those concerns that we could exit timely.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

We have got a track record as part of this bankruptcy to address the quarter-related issues. If that presented itself, we would do the same here.

Q Do you have any specifics? Can you be any more -- any more-detailed about what other options or mechanisms you might consider to raise more equity?

Α The only reason I'm pausing is to be more specific, is because I think what we have put forward a plan that is fully capitalized. We work extensively with all capital market participants to develop a plan where we are actually putting in \$16 billion of equity contribution, nine upfront, six over time. To the extent that concerns were raised, I think we would look at a way to continue to work with, again, everybody in the case to find a method to address it. until I understand specifically what the concern is, it's hard for me to be any more specific as to the action.

Q I understand you think there's enough there and I will just ask you again if there's anything more you want to say about what other mechanisms you might consider?

A We've set up a process with our equity backstop letter where we are intending

to raise the equity through a marketed raise, 1 2. as opposed to the backstop agreement. 3 could evaluate the opportunity at that point in time as we undertake that marketed raise, 5 whether or not there's more equity available, 6 but, again, I think we feel like this is 7 sufficiently capitalized. I wanted to ask you about securitization. I have heard some of the 9 10 testimony about it. I'm not sure I got all 11 of it. 12 Your testimony is that securitization will be rate neutral and in 13 14 specific -- specifically you said it will be 15 -- you will provide credits so that -- I can 16 show you where it is, but I am just 17 paraphrasing, so that customers on average 18 will not bear the associated costs of 19 securitization charges. 2.0 What does that mean on average? 21 What does that mean to ratepayers on average? 22 Α We're still in the process of 2.3 finalizing the securitization application. We intend to file that in a few weeks. 24 25 Currently what we're envisioning is 26 a securitization that on a present-value 27 basis customers would be rate neutral.

the refund -- the refund to the customers of

the shareholder NOL that are realized will 1 2. likely exceed the associated debt service cost for the securitization bonds in the 3 early years. So customers would have a rate 4 5 benefit early and as those securitization 6 bonds expire, on it customers would pay the 7 outer years' debt service costs so that on a present-value basis on average, customers are 8 made whole. 9 10 Is another way of saying that it's 11 going to be lumpy? 12 Possibly. But we're as part of the Α details of trying to finalize that 13 14 application, trying to make it as smooth as 15 possible. 16 But what I understand you to be 17 saying is it's not neutral to customers on a 18 yearly basis. Some years customers may realize the benefit, other years they may 19 realize the costs? 2.0 21 Α Over time, yes. 22 Okay. And the final question I 0 have about this and Mr. Johnson testified 2.3 about this, President Batjer asked 24 25 Mr. Johnson about what happens if 26 securitization doesn't go forward. I am not 27 going to ask you that again. But what if it doesn't go forward, and if it's not 2.8

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

ultimately approved, what is the impact on the key credit metrics that we look at, that the rating agencies look at, the funds from operation of debt, what are the metrics if securitization isn't approved?

A So the plan doesn't need securitization. We think it's in everybody's interest in all stakeholders' interest. If it's not approved, funds from operations, FFO-to-debt would likely be about 200 basis points lower than what we're projecting here which assumes securitization is approved.

Q And what does that do to your -- where you would end up in the credit ratings?

A It wouldn't change the -- so each of the credit ratings have a band for the quantitative credit metrics. We would still squarely be in the band of investment-grade credit metrics, even if securitization is not approved.

Where we see a challenge with the credit rating is more on the qualitative aspects of the plan, not the quantitative, even without securitization.

Q I understand. The same would be true for debt that EBITDA, you would still be within the band, even though you might be lower on the band?

| 1 | A We would be lower in the band but |
|----|---|
| 2 | within the investment grade ratings, yes. |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you |
| 4 | very much. |
| 5 | EXAMINATION |
| 6 | BY ALJ COOKE: |
| 7 | Q Okay. Mr. Wells, for the 7 billion |
| 8 | in anticipated ratepayer securitization |
| 9 | described on page 2-15 of Exhibit PG&E-1, |
| 10 | line 21, is that a subset of the fire claims |
| 11 | shown in Table 2.3 on page 2-16 of Exhibit |
| 12 | PG&E-1? |
| 13 | A I apologize, your Honor. I was |
| 14 | flipping the pages. |
| 15 | Q First go to page 2-15. |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q Line 21, there's the 7 billion in |
| 18 | anticipated ratepayer securitization? |
| 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q Is that a subset of the fire claims |
| 21 | that are shown in Table 2.3 on the next page? |
| 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q And is that \$7 billion of |
| 24 | anticipated ratepayer securitization |
| 25 | associated with claims for specific fires or |
| 26 | is that just \$7 billion of that total that's |
| 27 | in 2.3 associated with any of those elements? |
| 28 | A We are working through those |

Q

details. This testimony here is more the 1 It's 7 billion of the total 24 2. latter. billion that is presented in this table. 3 Okay. On page 2-3 of your 4 0 testimony in Exhibit PG&E-1, you state that 5 6 PG&E expects to achieve investment-grade 7 ratings for secured debt upon emergence. Is there anything within the plan that describes 8 9 what would occur if you did not achieve 10 investment-grade credit rating? 11 Α No. We don't. But we put this statement forward because of the extensive 12 work that we have done with the rating 13 14 agencies in money center banks. 15 Okay. And in this application, 0 16 you're requesting a large amount of 17 short-term debt authorization. To your 18 knowledge, does PG&E recover the debt-related 19 costs from ratepayers and if so how? 2.0 Α We are asking for two short-term 21 debt authorizations. One is sort of a very 22 temporary issue and there's only a small 2.3 percentage of that that we are intending to 24 include in our cost of capital advice filing. 25 The other short-term debt I know we would 26 recover from customers -- I am drawing a 27 blank as to where and how.

Okay. Counsel, could you provide a

follow-up on Monday for that? 1 2. MR. WEISSMANN: (Affirmative nod.) BY ALJ COOKE: 3 On page 2-19 of your testimony in 4 0 PG&E-1 --5 6 Α I am there. 7 -- at lines 13 through 16, you talk about the reduction in interest costs. 8 9 cost of debt, essentially reductions of about 10 a billion dollars as a result of the noteholder RSA. Do you see that? 11 I do. 12 Α It's my understanding that some of 13 0 14 the intervenor testimony estimates the cost 15 savings around 600 million rather than a 16 billion. Do you have any comments on the calculation differences? 17 18 А The nominal value of the savings is 19 a little bit more than a billion dollars. 2.0 Originally when I put forward this testimony, I used a debt discount rate because I was 21 22 evaluating it through the lens of the 2.3 company. 24 Intervenor testimony appropriately 25 pointed out that from a customer standpoint, 26 a more appropriate discount rate would be our 27 weighted cost of capital. So, yes, that 2.8 number is -- I think our collection was

| 1 | closer to 700 million, but directionally in |
|----|---|
| 2 | that ballpark. |
| 3 | Q So the difference is the intervenor |
| 4 | version or the somewhere between the |
| 5 | 600-and-700-million dollar calculation is |
| 6 | using weighted cost of capital? |
| 7 | A Yes, at the higher discount rate. |
| 8 | ALJ COOKE: All right. That concludes |
| 9 | my questions. |
| 10 | Do you have any redirect? |
| 11 | MR. WEISSMANN: Yes. |
| 12 | ALJ COOKE: Are you ready to go? |
| 13 | MR. WEISSMANN: Yes. |
| 14 | ALJ COOKE: Go forward. |
| 15 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 16 | BY MR. WEISSMANN: |
| 17 | Q Mr. Wells, you were asked some |
| 18 | questions by Commissioner Rechtschaffen about |
| 19 | the impact of securitization on the company's |
| 20 | credit ratings. So first I just want to |
| 21 | clarify between qualitative and quantitative. |
| 22 | On a quantitative side, can you |
| 23 | explain how securitization would affect the |
| 24 | company's quantitative credit metrics as |
| 25 | measured by S&P? |
| 26 | A S&P essentially excludes the debts |
| 27 | associated with securitization in the |
| 28 | calculation of FFO-to-debt. So there's a |

lower essentially denominator and therefore a 1 2 higher ratio under the S&P methodology when securitization is included. 3 So all else equal, does that 4 increase? 5 6 Α All else equal, it increases the 7 FFO-to-debt. And the implication of that for 8 9 credit ratings? It's obviously favorable for credit 10 Α 11 ratings to have a higher FFO-to-debt free. 12 Let's talk about the qualitative side, the business risk. How in your 13 14 judgment would a Commission decision 15 approving securitization affect the rating 16 agency's evaluation of the company's business risk? 17 18 А I think it's an important signal. 19 Let me step back. 2.0 One of the larger concerns of the 21 California regulatory environment after the 22 denial of San Diego Gas & Electric's claim 2.3 for wildfire costs as part of the 2007, 2008 24 fires, created a perception in the financial 25 community that utilities would likely not be 26 able to recover costs in the future. 27 I think a securitization that is

approved would offset that previous decision

and lead to more optimism around potential 1 2. recovery in the future and therefore a better 3 assessment of the qualitative factors for the utility credit ratings. 4 5 While we are on that topic, you 6 were asked some questions about decision, 7 sorry, investigation, the presiding officer's decision in Investigation 19-06-015. Do you 9 have any views about the impact of that 10 presiding officer's decision on the same 11 qualitative factors that you were just 12 discussing? I think it is credit negative 13 Α 14 on a qualitative basis to modify settlements, 15 because it introduces unpredictability in the 16 It also -- another regulatory process. 17 factor the market looks to is timely decision 18 making. And modifying settlements creates 19 the potential that parties will be more 2.0 reticent to engage in settlement discussions. MS. SHERIFF: Your Honor, I believe 21 22 this is a bit beyond the scope of my 2.3 questioning on that presiding officer's 24 decision. 25 ALJ COOKE: I understand what you might 26 think. I'm going to allow him to answer, but 27 briefly. 2.8 THE WITNESS: I think it creates

potential uncertainty that heightens risk 1 and, therefore, is -- challenges the 2. 3 qualitative aspects of the credit ratings. BY MR. WEISSMANN: 4 You were asked some questions by 5 6 counsel about A4NR about the stress test 7 around future efforts, events. You mentioned 20 percent transmission distribution rate 9 base. Where did that figure come from? 10 Δ AB 1054. 11 Can you be more specific? Is there 12 a provision in 1054 that relates to that metric? 13 14 The potential for losses under --15 for catastrophic fires were a utility deemed 16 to be imprudent. 17 On page 2-15 there is a sentence 0 18 that you were examined about that I want to 19 It is on lines 24 through 27, and clarify. 2.0 there is a reference here. Are you there? 21 Α I am. 22 PG&E will use the proceeds for the realization of the shareholder certain tax 2.3 24 benefits. Do you see that? 25 А I do. And by "certain" did you mean that 26 27 there were certain tax benefits or that the tax benefits were definitely going to happen? 2.8

Maybe would it be better for the sentence to 1 Realization of certain tax holder 2 benefits? 3 А Yes. 4 MS. KELLY: Your Honor, I would like to 5 6 limit the use of leading questions. 7 MR. GEESMAN: Or rewriting testimony by counsel. 8 9 ALJ COOKE: I understand your concerns. 10 I'm allowing the answer. 11 BY MR. WEISSMANN: You were asked some questions about 12 13 whether the utility's assets are subject to 14 Under the debtor in possession liens. 15 financing, are utility assets subject to 16 liens? 17 Α Yes, they are. 18 You were asked a question about the 19 treatment of Tubbs claims, claims arising 2.0 from the Tubbs fire. Under the TCC RSA are those claims resolved? 21 22 Α Yes. They were included in the TCC 2.3 RSA. 24 O You were asked a question about 25 whether holding company debt could have an 26 impact on utility's cost of debt. You said 27 it could, within certain thresholds. Do you 2.8 remember that?

Α I do. 1 Is the quantum holding company debt 2. under the plan of reorganization, would that 3 affect the utility's cost of debt? 4 5 Α No. You were asked some questions by 6 0 7 counsel for TURN and EPUC about the fees that are being -- as to which the company would 9 seek recovery, the financing professional 10 fees. Do you recall that? 11 Α I do. 12 Can you summarize the quantum, 13 estimated quantum of the bankruptcy-related 14 fees that the company is not seeking recovery 15 of? 16 Our current estimate is just under Α 17 1.6 billion. 18 You were asked some questions about 19 potential securitization transaction. In 2.0 your experience, do securitization 21 transactions typically permit prepayments? 22 Α Not in my experience. 2.3 You were asked some questions, 0 24 going back to the subject of the estimate, 25 estimated 154 million of financing fees that 26 the company would seek to recover. You said 27 the quantum is uncertain and subject to 2.8 change; is that correct?

| 1 | A That is correct. |
|--|---|
| 2 | Q If that amount changed, would the |
| 3 | company seek recovery of fees that would |
| 4 | exceed the net savings to customers from the |
| 5 | debt financing? |
| 6 | A No. |
| 7 | Q You were asked some questions |
| 8 | regarding a data response, in which the |
| 9 | company stated in that data response that it |
| 10 | had not at that time made a final |
| 11 | determination regarding its intended recovery |
| 12 | of the 2017-2018 wildfire costs. Do you |
| 13 | recall that? |
| 14 | A I do. |
| 15 | Q Are you certain of the date what |
| 16 | is the date on which the company made a final |
| 17 | determination of its approach with respect to |
| | |
| 18 | that subject relative to the date of that |
| 18 19 | that subject relative to the date of that data response? |
| | |
| 19 | data response? |
| 19 20 | data response? MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can we |
| 19 20 21 | data response? MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can we get clarification as to what |
| 19 20 21 22 | data response? MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can we get clarification as to what cross-examination we are referring to here? |
| 19 20 21 22 23 | data response? MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can we get clarification as to what cross-examination we are referring to here? I'm not recalling. |
| 19 20 21 22 23 24 | data response? MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can we get clarification as to what cross-examination we are referring to here? I'm not recalling. ALJ COOKE: Do you recall which |
| 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | data response? MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your Honor, can we get clarification as to what cross-examination we are referring to here? I'm not recalling. ALJ COOKE: Do you recall which cross-examiner asked the question? |

| 1 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
|--|---|
| 2 | record. |
| 3 | While we were off the record we had |
| 4 | a discussion about this particular question, |
| 5 | and we are going to forgo this question. |
| 6 | MR. WEISSMANN: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 7 | Can I have just one second, please? |
| 8 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 9 | (Off the record.) |
| 10 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 11 | record. |
| 12 | Mr. Weissmann has indicated he did |
| 13 | not have any further questions. So we have |
| 14 | limited opportunity for recross. |
| | |
| 15 | Mr. Geesman. |
| 15 16 | Mr. Geesman. RECROSS-EXAMINATION |
| | |
| 16 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 16 17 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: |
| 16 17 18 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the |
| 16 17 18 19 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as positive for your credit metrics or not. I |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as positive for your credit metrics or not. I believe your answer was confined to Standard |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as positive for your credit metrics or not. I believe your answer was confined to Standard & Poor's. Isn't it true that Moody's is less |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as positive for your credit metrics or not. I believe your answer was confined to Standard & Poor's. Isn't it true that Moody's is less permissive about your ability to |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as positive for your credit metrics or not. I believe your answer was confined to Standard & Poor's. Isn't it true that Moody's is less permissive about your ability to de-consolidate securitization from your |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GEESMAN: Q Mr. Weissmann asked you whether the rating agencies would view securitization as positive for your credit metrics or not. I believe your answer was confined to Standard & Poor's. Isn't it true that Moody's is less permissive about your ability to de-consolidate securitization from your balance sheet? |

Ms. Sheriff. 1 MS. SHERIFF: No recross, your Honor. 3 ALJ COOKE: Thank you. 4 Ms. Kelly. 5 MS. KELLY: No recross, your Honor. 6 ALJ COOKE: Thank you. 7 Mr. Abrams, it should be limited to the questions for which redirect was related 8 9 to your questions. 10 MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. 11 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. ABRAMS: 13 0 Amongst all the questions he didn't 14 mention me by name, so it was very difficult 15 for me to understand exactly. I did bring up 16 to Tubbs fire TCC RSA. On cross I would like to understand what you mean by "resolved"? 17 18 А The Tubbs fire victims were 19 considered as part of the total settlement. 2.0 So the settlement is intended to compensate Tubbs victims with other fire victims. 21 22 0 I quess I'm still lacking the 2.3 understanding of what "resolved" means. 2.4 "resolved" mean the Commission can't start an 25 investigation into Tubbs? Does it mean that 26 other wildfire survivors couldn't seek 27 compensation through Tubbs? What does "resolved" mean? 2.8

| 1 | A Settled the amount of the claim. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q Just specific to that, not beyond |
| 3 | it; is that correct? |
| 4 | A That is correct. |
| 5 | Q Thank you. |
| 6 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 7 | Mr. Alcantar. |
| 8 | MR. ALCANTAR: I wouldn't dare. |
| 9 | ALJ COOKE: Mr. Finkelstein. |
| 10 | MR. FINKELSTEIN: No, thank you. |
| 11 | ALJ COOKE: Mr. Miley. |
| 12 | MR. MILEY: Nothing, your Honor. |
| 13 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Wells, for |
| 14 | your testimony. You are excused. |
| 15 | At this time let's go off the |
| 16 | record. |
| 17 | (Whereupon, at the hour of 12:56 p.m. a recess was taken until 1:00 |
| 18 | p.m.) |
| 19 | * * * * |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

| 1 | AFTERNOON SESSION - 2:00 P.M. |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | * * * * |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 5 | record. |
| 6 | At this time we will call to the |
| 7 | stand Ms. Brownell. |
| 8 | NORA MEAD BROWNELL, called as a |
| 9 | <pre>witness by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, having been sworn, testified as follows:</pre> |
| 10 | as lollows: |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: I do. |
| 12 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Please be |
| 13 | seated, and state your name and place of |
| 14 | business for the record. |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: My name is Nora Mead |
| 16 | Brownell. Place of business currently is at |
| 17 | PG&E, in California. |
| 18 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 19 | Mr. Weissmann. |
| 20 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 21 | BY MR. WEISSMANN: |
| 22 | Q Good afternoon, Ms. Brownell. What |
| 23 | is your position at PG&E? |
| 24 | A I'm the Chairman of the Board, of |
| 25 | the corporation. |
| 26 | Q That would be PG&E Corporation? |
| 27 | A That is correct. |
| 28 | Q Do you have before you what has |

| 1 | been marked for identification as PG&E-1, the |
|----|---|
| 2 | volume of prepared testimony? |
| 3 | A I do. |
| 4 | Q And within that volume are you |
| 5 | sponsoring Chapter 4? |
| 6 | A I am. |
| 7 | Q Do you have before you what has |
| 8 | been marked for identification as PG&E-4, |
| 9 | which is a volume of exhibits to your |
| 10 | testimony? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q Excuse me. |
| 13 | A Oops. |
| 14 | Q Within PG&E, do you have before you |
| 15 | what has been marked as PG&E-4? |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q Within PG&E-4 are you sponsoring |
| 18 | Exhibit 1 to your testimony? |
| 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q Do you have before you what has |
| 21 | been marked for identification as PG&E-5? |
| 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q Within that volume, that comprises |
| 24 | Exhibits 2 through 7 of your testimony, which |
| 25 | you are sponsoring; correct? |
| 26 | A Yes. |
| 27 | Q And you have before you what has |
| 28 | been marked as PG&E-6? |

| 1 | A Yes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Q And within that volume that |
| 3 | contains Exhibits 8 through 23 to your |
| 4 | testimony, which you are also sponsoring; |
| 5 | correct? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q Do you have before you what has |
| 8 | been marked for identification as PG&E-7, |
| 9 | which contains supplemental testimony, |
| 10 | including errata? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q Within that volume does that |
| 13 | include the errata to your testimony in |
| 14 | Chapter 4? |
| 15 | A It does. |
| 16 | Q I've just identified the portions |
| 17 | of the exhibits that you are sponsoring. Was |
| 18 | that was that material prepared by you or |
| 19 | at your direction? |
| 20 | A It was. |
| 21 | Q And do you adopt that as your |
| 22 | testimony? |
| 23 | A I do. |
| 24 | Q Is it true and correct to the best |
| 25 | of your knowledge and belief? |
| 26 | A It is. |
| 27 | MR. WEISSMANN: Your Honor, the witness |
| 28 | is available for cross-examination. |

| 1 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Weissmann. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Let's be off the record briefly. |
| 3 | (Off the record.) |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 5 | record. |
| 6 | At this time we will have |
| 7 | cross-examination by Ms. Sheriff for CLECA. |
| 8 | MS. SHERIFF: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 9 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 10 | BY MS. SHERIFF: |
| 11 | Q Good afternoon, Ms. Brownell. |
| 12 | A Good afternoon. |
| 13 | Q My name is Nora Sheriff. I |
| 14 | represent the California Large Energy |
| 15 | Consumers Association, or CLECA. They are |
| 16 | large industrial customers of PG&E and |
| 17 | Southern California Edison Company. |
| 18 | At page 4-8 of your testimony in |
| 19 | what has been marked for identification as |
| 20 | PG&E-1, you discuss director independence. |
| 21 | Am I correct in understanding that you mean |
| 22 | the general idea is that the Board shouldn't |
| 23 | be too close to management? |
| 24 | A I think it is a board owes its |
| 25 | responsibility to the corporation, shouldn't |
| 26 | be too close to management, shouldn't be too |
| 27 | close to anyone with vested interest in the |
| 28 | company. I think it is pretty well defined |

| 1 | in the New York Stock Exchange rules. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q Okay. On that same page you also |
| 3 | talked about the committee of board members |
| 4 | being able to, quote, "require reports from |
| 5 | management," end quote. |
| 6 | Do you agree that management |
| 7 | shouldn't be the only source of information |
| 8 | to the Board? |
| 9 | A Absolutely. |
| 10 | Q Okay. So having a separate source |
| 11 | of technical information and evaluation would |
| 12 | improve the independence of the Board? |
| 13 | A It would improve the independence, |
| 14 | and it would expand the information that you |
| 15 | use in decision making. And, in fact, we do |
| 16 | have reports from technical experts, |
| 17 | including the experts by hired by the |
| 18 | CPUC, NorthStar. |
| 19 | Q Okay. Other than NorthStar, do |
| 20 | those technical experts report to the Board |
| 21 | or do they report to management? |
| 22 | A They report to management, but the |
| 23 | Board has |
| 24 | Q Thank you. |
| 25 | A unfettered access. |
| 26 | Q At page 4-32 you reference Public |
| 27 | Safety Power Shutoff events and the utility's |
| 28 | worker safety. Are you aware of the |

environment?

potential for calamitous impact to worker 1 2. safety should a complex industrial site suddenly and with no notice lose power? 3 Α Yes, I am. 4 Are you aware of the potentially 5 6 hazardous environmental impacts that could 7 occur in such a situation? Α Yes, I am. 8 9 Are you aware that some industrial 10 customers in PG&E's service territory lost 11 power due to the October 2019 Public Safety 12 Power Shutoff events and had no notice, 13 multiple times? 14 Α I've read that. I'm not aware of 15 it personally and didn't see it at this time, 16 but it is certainly possible. 17 And are you aware that those 18 industrial customers who lost power multiple 19 times with absolutely no notice from PG&E did 2.0 not see an improvement in PG&E's execution of the fall 2019 PSPS events? 21 22 I'm aware. We've had a number of Α 2.3 complaints about our notification and 24 communication, and we are working very hard 25 to improve that. 26 As you said earlier, you are aware 27 of potential danger to worker safety and the

Α 1 I am. 2. What do you think can be done to make sure that those events in the fall of 3 2019 and the risk that they pose to worker safety industrial sites and the environment 5 6 do not happen again in 2020? 7 Α I think we are taking a number of steps and, recently reviewed the Wildfire 9 Safety Plan that has been submitted, in addition to the other activities. 10 11 First and foremost, our 12 notification system has to be better. It has to be more accurate. And we've taken 13 14 considerable steps to do that. 15 Secondly, the work on hardening our 16 systems' vegetation management and all the 17 other sectionalization, GO tagging our lines, 18 will give us better information and allow us 19 to manage those with smaller scope and, 2.0 hopefully, shorter duration. 21 Excuse me. I only have 22 five minutes, and I just have one final 2.3 question. You can expand on redirect with 24 your counsel. 25 Do you think there should be a 26 targeted focus effort for large power 27 industrial customers because of these

additional risks that they seek?

2.8

MR. WEISSMANN: Could you repeat the 1 question? I couldn't quite hear. 2. BY MS. SHERIFF: 3 In terms of making sure the 2020 4 0 Public Safety Power Shutoff events do not 5 6 pose the same risks to large power customers 7 with complex industrial sites where there is concern of worker safety and hazardous 8 9 impacts to the environment should a sudden 10 loss of power occur with no notice, do you think, Ms. Brownell, that there should be a 11 12 focused effort as to those large power 13 customers? 14 Α I absolutely believe there should be a focused effort of those customers and 15 16 all at-risk customers. There is particular 17 focus on doing a far better job than that. 18 So I certainly understand. 19 MS. SHERIFF: Thank you. I have no 2.0 further questions. 21 ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. Given that Ms. Sheriff needs to 22 2.3 leave, I'm going to take the unusual step of 24 saying: Is there any redirect for her 25 questions? No, your Honor. 26 MR. WEISSMANN: 27 MS. SHERIFF: Thank you very much, your 2.8 Honor. I appreciate that.

| 1 | ALJ COOKE: Also for the record |
|--|--|
| 2 | Commissioner Rechtschaffen has rejoined me on |
| 3 | the dais on that earlier line of questioning. |
| 4 | Next is Ms. Kelly, MCE. |
| 5 | MS. KELLY: Thank you very much. |
| 6 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 7 | BY MS. KELLY: |
| 8 | Q Good afternoon. Welcome. I have a |
| 9 | few short questions. |
| 10 | Would you please turn to page 4-4 |
| 11 | of your testimony. |
| 12 | A I'm there. |
| 13 | Q Thank you. |
| 14 | So in the first bullet a board |
| 15 | fulfills its role in a variety of ways, |
| 16 | including, and what does your first bullet |
| 17 | point say? |
| 18 | A Setting an appropriate tone |
| 19 | from the top to actively |
| 20 | cultivate corporate culture |
| 21 | |
| | that gives priority to |
| 22 | that gives priority to integrity, ethical |
| 22 23 | |
| | integrity, ethical |
| 23 | integrity, ethical standards, full compliance |
| 23 24 | integrity, ethical standards, full compliance with legal requirements, |
| 232425 | integrity, ethical standards, full compliance with legal requirements, professionalism, fair |

objectives. 1 So does the Board of PG&E 2. Corporation currently set an appropriate tone 3 from the top to actively cultivate a 4 corporate culture, in this whole first 5 6 bullet? 7 I absolutely believe that it does. And it includes getting to know the employees 9 at the local level, doubling the number of 10 field visits, actually more than doubling, to 11 80, to get a really intense deep dive into 12 all the business practices of the company, and a number of activities. So we tried to 13 14 be visible, engaged and knowledgeable. 15 0 Great. 16 Does PG&E generally have a 17 corporate culture that gives priority to 18 integrity as standards, full compliance with 19 legal requirements, professionalism, fair 2.0 dealing and socially responsible pursuit of 21 the company's business objectives? 22 Α I believe we have 23,000 employees 2.3 who work very hard to live up to those 24 obligations and to set a culture of 25 integrity, and all of the things we list 26 below. 27 So on a yes or no basis, does the

corporate culture have those attributes at

this time? 1 Α 2. Yes. So I've reviewed many of your --3 the exhibits to your testimony. You don't 4 need to turn to any of them in particular. 5 Ι did notice that none of them specifically 6 7 addressed governance related to investor-owned utilities or entities in the 8 9 public goods. So why is that? 10 Α I believe the same rules apply 11 whether you are a utility or a chemical 12 company. Although, I think with the utility, or when I worked at a bank, when you have a 13 14 regulated monopoly you have a special 15 obligation, I think that is a social 16 responsibility, as well as a responsible --17 in a utilities to deliver safe, reliable, 18 affordable service. 19 And so is that social 2.0 responsibility a fiduciary duty? 21 Α I think a successful company who 22 fulfills -- with a board that fulfills its 2.3 fiduciary responsibilities is committed to 24 Safety, for example, is a all those things. 25 platform for fulfilling your fiduciary responsibility. 26 27 0 Thank you. That is sufficient. 2.8 And if you turn to page 4-19 of

| 1 | your testimony. |
|--|---|
| 2 | A I'm there. |
| 3 | Q Great. |
| 4 | The second bullet. This relates |
| 5 | the target of PG&E to have at least |
| 6 | 50 percent California resident directors at |
| 7 | Chapter 11 emergence? |
| 8 | A That is correct. |
| 9 | Q Is that an ongoing goal and |
| 10 | commitment? |
| 11 | A It is. |
| 12 | Q And have you considered commitments |
| 13 | to having directors within PG&E's service |
| 14 | territory, or have you evaluated it? |
| 15 | A We have not yet. We've just begun |
| | |
| 16 | the refresh process, but certainly can take |
| | the refresh process, but certainly can take that into consideration. We currently have |
| 16 | |
| 16 17 | that into consideration. We currently have |
| 16 17 18 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's |
| 16 17 18 19 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. MS. KELLY: Thank you. I have no |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. MS. KELLY: Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. MS. KELLY: Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor. ALJ COOKE: Thank you. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. MS. KELLY: Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor. ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Next up is Mr. Geesman with A4NR. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. MS. KELLY: Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor. ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Next up is Mr. Geesman with A4NR. MR. GEESMAN: Your Honor, I may have |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | that into consideration. We currently have several members who are in fact in PG&E's service territory. MS. KELLY: Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor. ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Next up is Mr. Geesman with A4NR. MR. GEESMAN: Your Honor, I may have been unclear with your earlier inquiry about |

| 1 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
|----|---|
| 2 | (Off the record.) |
| 3 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 4 | record. |
| 5 | Go ahead, Mr. Geesman. |
| 6 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 7 | BY MR. GEESMAN: |
| 8 | Q Good afternoon, Ms. Brownell. |
| 9 | A Good afternoon. |
| 10 | Q My name is John Geesman. We knew |
| 11 | each other years and years ago. |
| 12 | A We did indeed. |
| 13 | Q Today I am representing the |
| 14 | Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility and their |
| 15 | interest in this proceeding is the impact of |
| 16 | the PG&E Plan of Reorganization on |
| 17 | ratepayers. |
| 18 | At page 4-23, lines 31 and 32, your |
| 19 | testimony, you describe part of PG&E's |
| 20 | fundamental objective as delivering |
| 21 | affordable energy to its customers. And at |
| 22 | page 4-25, lines 3 and 4, you speak of PG&E's |
| 23 | mission of safely and reliably delivering |
| 24 | affordable service. |
| 25 | As a former utility regulator, what |
| 26 | do you mean when you use that word |
| 27 | "affordable?" |
| 28 | A I think that's a good question |

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

because sometimes it's interpreted as eye of the beholder and I don't think that's the standard. I think a utility has to operate as efficiently as it possibly can in allocating capital to the appropriate resources that will not only provide safe infrastructure but infrastructure that is cost-efficient. I believe it needs to manage its resources, certainly the resources of both -- of its ratepayers very carefully to bring down the costs.

And, in fact, as part of our Plan
For Reorganization, we through the Finance
Committee but through all of the boards are
taking a good look at our business processes,
at our procurement, at our IT to make sure
that we are operating appropriately and
efficiently and I think there's room for
improvement. So we hope to be able to bring
down costs in our operating systems.

Q Is there any quantitative performance metric that you believe the Board should apply in determining whether PG&E is successful in this affordable objective?

A I think there are a number of metrics. One of the metrics that the Finance Committee is using working with this CFO is monthly report on costs, on number of

employees on individual budgets for which the 1 2. directors of those budgets, owners of those budgets, are held accountable both to the 3 Finance Committee as well as the boards. 4 Did those cost-reduction steps that 5 6 the Board has initiated extend to reviewing 7 utility-owned generation for cost-related retirement? 8 9 We have not yet done that. I can't 10 say it's not being done. I have not yet seen 11 any material on that. But so far, it's not been at the 12 top of your priority list? 13 14 Α I wouldn't say it's not been at the 15 top of my priority list. I just haven't seen 16 any work that's been done. There are any 17 number of initiatives being looked at as part 18 of our restructuring. 19 Can I ask you to take a look at the 2.0 cross-examination exhibit A4NR-X-3, which is 21 a table found on page 21 of the company's 22 February 18, 2020 Form 10-K filing? 2.3 Α A4NR-X-3. Sorry. Got it. 24 Table taken from the 10-K? O 25 Α I see. 26 I would like you to focus on that 27 44.6 percent number near the bottom of the

table right above the line that says "Total

| 1 | 100.0 Percent." |
|----|--|
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q You ought to read the footnotes |
| 4 | associated with that as well. |
| 5 | A Give me a moment. I'm old now. |
| 6 | Q Sure. |
| 7 | A I think I have it. |
| 8 | Q Would it be correct to say that in |
| 9 | 2019, PG&E sold off a sizeable proportion of |
| 10 | its generation and procurement portfolio? |
| 11 | A I'm not entirely familiar with the |
| 12 | details of that. We did I don't recall |
| 13 | that we have actually. |
| 14 | Q 44.6 percent is a pretty large |
| 15 | number; is it not? |
| 16 | A Yeah. I'd have to really get back |
| 17 | to you, sir, with the details of that. |
| 18 | Q I'm not talking about selling off |
| 19 | the underlying assets. I am talking about |
| 20 | selling off the output. Given what hours of |
| 21 | electricity generated, as I read that table, |
| 22 | it suggests that you sold 44.6 percent of it |
| 23 | to the CAISO marketplace. |
| 24 | A I believe that to be accurate but I |
| 25 | honestly really would need to familiarize |
| 26 | myself with the details. |
| 27 | Q In if fact that 44.6 percent was an |
| 28 | accurate number, that would represent a lot |

of churn, would it not? 1 It would. 2. Α Do you think it's consistent with 3 0 PG&E's affordability objective to maintain an 4 electricity supply portfolio that is that 5 6 much in excess of your customer's needs? 7 Α I think that we need to carefully balance that. I certainly understand the 8 9 nature of your question. I do believe it 10 would be responsible to look at that. 11 At page 4-27, lines 3 to 5, you 12 testify that the new boards are working with 13 management to identify ways to -- and I am 14 quoting, "achieve greater operational 15 efficiency and financial discipline to 16 enhance value to customers." Close quote. 17 You have been there a little while 18 Could you describe any progress you've 19 made on that score? 2.0 Α Yes. We have looked hard and long 21 at our procurement process which we found to be inefficient and reactive. And I think 22 that can be said for one of the things if you 2.3 24 look at some of the issues we are 25 confronting, that the company has been in a 26 reactive mode. We have reassigned 27 procurement at a higher level. We've been 2.8 working with our restructuring experts to

streamline the process, but at the same time 1 2. get better transparency and more discipline; RFPs that clearly articulate the need before 3 we sign a contract as opposed to after we've 4 5 signed a contract. 6 During the initial disasters, 7 people were just hiring contractors at will and we walked that back. So there's better 8 9 accountability and frankly I think more consolidation of information and data which 10 11 has been an issue at the company so that we 12 can better manage that process. I spoke about the work --13 14 Ms. Brownell, I am sorry to ALJ COOKE: 15 interrupt. When you said procurement --16 looking at the procurement process, are you 17 speaking about procurement of goods and 18 services versus power procurement? 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 2.0 ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Thank you for 21 that. 22 THE WITNESS: As I mentioned, working 2.3 with the Finance Committee, we are trying to 24 look and hold people accountable at a 25 director level for managing budgets more 26 carefully. We're trying to work with the HR 27 folks, not only to streamline the system so

that we can hire the right people at the

| 1 | appropriate time, but with less cumbersome |
|----|---|
| 2 | bureaucracy and paperwork and more responsive |
| 3 | to the business needs. We have looked at our |
| 4 | IT systems and are speaking with a very |
| 5 | sophisticated data management artifical |
| 6 | intelligence company based in California to |
| 7 | help us with an overlay of our data so that |
| 8 | we can get a more integrated picture of the |
| 9 | various parts of the business including |
| 10 | safety, procurement, finance. |
| 11 | Q Page 4-29, lines 16, all the way |
| 12 | through page 4-31, line 19, you provide an |
| 13 | extended description of PG&E's two SNO |
| 14 | committees? |
| 15 | A Yes. |
| 16 | Q Can you tell me what the letters |
| 17 | SNO stand for? |
| 18 | A Safety Nuclear Oversight. |
| 19 | Q There is an SNO Committee at the |
| 20 | utility and one at the holding company as |
| 21 | well, right? |
| 22 | A There is an SNO Committee that is |
| 23 | comprised of the same people that serves both |
| 24 | the utility and the corporation. |
| 25 | Q And you're a member of that |
| 26 | committee? |
| 27 | A I am a member. |
| 28 | Q Are you aware that the Commission |

2.8

requires in a decision identified as 1 2. D.19-06-008 PG&E is to supply it with nonconfidential versions of the minutes of 3 all Board of Directors and SNO Committee 5 meetings? 6 Α I am. 7 0 Are you aware that the controversy over when the minutes got sent in that I 8 9 discussed with Mr. Vesey yesterday? I am aware of it and I can 10 Δ 11 certainly comment. That has been a huge 12 Since we came to the company, we have issue. 13 had probably, I don't know, four or five 14 They completely times as many meetings. 15 overwhelmed the corporate secretary's office. 16 So we've done a number of things. 17 First, I outsourced the committee 18 meeting minutes and the Board minutes to our 19 outside counsel. It's an expensive solution 2.0 but needed to be done because we can't afford 21 to get behind. We have chosen a new 22 corporate secretary who is restructuring the 2.3 department so that we can be more timely. 24 It's an embarrassment, frankly to me 25 personally, as well as the company, and we 26 respect the Commission and our obligations.

governance and that is not a demonstration.

We also, frankly, respect good corporate

| 1 | Q I really want to thank you for |
|----|---|
| 2 | being here today. Those are all of my |
| 3 | questions. |
| 4 | Thank you, your Honor. |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 6 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Geesman. |
| 7 | All right. Our next cross-examiner |
| 8 | is Mr. Long from TURN. |
| 9 | MR. LONG: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 10 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 11 | BY MR. LONG: |
| 12 | Q Good afternoon, Ms. Brownell. I am |
| 13 | Tom Long with TURN. |
| 14 | I want to start by talking just a |
| 15 | little bit about your résumé. I know you're |
| 16 | a former State and Federal regulator. Are |
| 17 | you a lawyer? |
| 18 | A I am not. |
| 19 | Q Lucky you. You're probably a |
| 20 | happier person for it. |
| 21 | A Well, one of my mentors was |
| 22 | Governor Dick Thornburgh. When I told him I |
| 23 | was going to law school he said, "You will |
| 24 | hate law school. Don't do it." I took his |
| 25 | advice. He was a smart guy. |
| 26 | Q Okay. Now you joined the Board in |
| 27 | April 2019; is that right? |
| | |

What were the key elements of 1 0 2. PG&E's history that you felt you needed to be informed about in order to be an effective 3 Board chair? 4 Well, first let me say that having 5 А 6 been involved in the energy crisis in 2001 during my tenure at the FERC, I followed 7 PG&E's history and California's history very 8 9 closely. 10 We certainly had an onboarding 11 process that reviewed all of the major incidents that had occurred in the -- in 12 recent and fairly past history to get a 13 14 better understanding of the causes and of the 15 solutions. 16 Again, that has formed some of our 17 views in the things that we needed to focus 18 on at the company. We also looked at issues 19 like employee safety, which is a major 2.0 concern for me. The company's been in the 21 fourth quartile of employee safety for almost 22 20 years. That's just not a record we want 2.3 to continue. We want to see our employees as 24 well as the public as safe as possible. 25 So, I don't know if that answers your question. 26 We looked at a lot of things 27 during our onboarding and continue to do so. Okay. You said that in this 2.8 Q

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

onboarding process, you reviewed -- I think you said all major incidents of the past and recent years.

Based on what you've learned about PG&E's safety problems of the past decade, what is your perception of the reason or reasons for those problems?

A It's hard for me to repeat history when I wasn't there. But my observations are, one, we need to renew our commitment to safety. Two, we need to and have revamped our compensation with a much greater focus on safety metrics to capture everyone's attention and to get them to focus on the right issue. Three, we need to develop better data and better data sets. Hence, our recent consultation with several firms who do that. Third, I think we need to be sure that our employees have better tools.

One of the issues with recordkeeping is that it was paper-driven which increases both the opportunity for just simple human error. It's also time-consuming and took supervisors out of the field, where their presence is critical to managing safety issues.

I could go on and on, but I hope that gives you a picture.

Well, looking at the types of 1 0 2. problems that --ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record for 3 a second. 4 (Off the record.) 5 6 ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the 7 record. BY MR. LONG: 8 9 Looking at the types of problems 10 that have taken place in the past decade and 11 I am just going to go over a quick summary of 12 some of them. There was a problem with the 13 Locate and Mark Tracking System. There were 14 problems with recordkeeping in both the Gas 15 Transmission System and the Gas Distribution 16 I see you're nodding your head. System. 17 both of these you have agreed that there are 18 problems. 19 Yes, I have agreed, yes. Α 2.0 The monitor, the federal monitor 0 21 identified problems with enhanced vegetation 22 management recordkeeping; is that right? 2.3 Α Yes. There were problems with the 24 0 25 October PSPS events with the website and communications; is that right? 26 27 Α Yes. There were inspections that failed 2.8 Q

to find unsafe equipment leading to 1 wildfires; is that right? 2. 3 Α Yes. Again, back to the Locate and Mark, 4 0 5 there was a management failure to correct 6 problems that were widely known in the 7 organization; is that right? Apparently. I wasn't there, but 8 Α 9 yes. 10 0 So to me these strike me as 11 wide-ranging problems in a diversity of areas 12 of operations and various aspects of the 13 operations. Does it strike you that way as 14 well? 15 It strikes me as a problem with 16 underlying business fundamentals. I spoke 17 earlier of a procurement process that was not 18 as transparent or financially-disciplined or 19 focused on the right things. I think I 2.0 mentioned our IT systems and in fact that is 21 one of the problems with our recordkeeping. 22 I mentioned technology as a 2.3 solution to at least part of the inputs to those data sets. So, you might define them 24 25 as wide-ranging and they certainly are, but I don't think the solutions are difficult to 26 27 I think while we are certainly focused

on wildfire safety and improving all of that,

2.8

27

2.8

on history.

we also have to make this an organization 1 that follows what I would call common 2. business practices. 3 When you have a diversity of 4 5 problems like this, doesn't that also indicate that there were problems at the 6 7 senior management level? I can't speak to a period of time 8 Α 9 in which I was not present. 10 And your onboarding and learning 0 11 about this didn't inform you -- enable you to 12 inform yourself about that. Is that a 13 question? 14 Α It certainly informs the way we 15 look forward and the way we hold our current 16 management accountable; the way we interact 17 with our management. The level of engagement 18 of this Board, unlike a Board that you would 19 find in a typical company is what I would 2.0 almost call an activist Board really doing 21 deep dives into places that you normally 22 wouldn't go. 2.3 But the statute, the reason we're 0 24 here, AB 1054 says we are supposed to 25 consider PG&E's governance in light of its

And I am asking whether, based on

safety history. So that is why I am focusing

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

the history that you have seen, whether you have concerns about how senior management has conducted itself.

A Again, on our onboarding, we looked at certainly the history. And what it does is inform me on what we need to have from management going forward. Could I speculate on failures of management or people who are participants and employees? I could, but honestly it would be speculation.

Q Okay. And you did not undertake an effort to determine whether issues with senior management were in any way responsible for the types of issues we just went over?

A I believe it informs what I do today. I don't know that spending time speculating on the behavior of previous management would be particularly helpful. I need to spend my time on fixing problems and holding people accountable going forward.

Q Do you have an opinion about whether PG&E has been sufficiently clear about its expectations for senior management in the past?

A Again, I wasn't there in the past so I really can't speculate. What I can say is we have changed our compensation to reflect what I believe is a greater degree of

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

accountability for public safety, employee safety, wildfire mitigation and infrastructure management.

Q Okay. I am going to shift now to a different topic and ask you to look at page 4-8 of your testimony. And I am again going to, as Ms. Sheriff did, ask you a question or two about the word "independent" that you used on that page in the second paragraph.

A Yes.

Q I know Ms. Sheriff asked you a question or two about that, but I just want to get a clear definition from you. Does "independent" as you use it on line 10 mean that the Board member is not an officer or employer -- employee of the company? Is that what you mean by "independent?"

A No. More than that I mean they're independent from any material interests in the company or partners to the company. I think they're independent from any special influence, if I had to paraphrase the New York Stock Exchange.

So that would include all kinds of people, including vendors, including shareholders, including politics. We need not to be -- we need to be free of anything

that might compromise decision-making. 1 2. So the Board -- so a Board member 3 to be independent should not be a shareholder? 4 5 I'm not saying that. In fact, in many boards, you're encouraged to be a 6 7 shareholder because it's a demonstration of your belief in the long-term viability and 8 9 success in the company. So I think if you 10 were a majority shareholder of the company, 11 that probably would not be viewed as 12 independent from -- by the New York Stock 13 Exchange. 14 Okay. So "independent" includes 15 not being a majority shareholder? 16 Α Yes. 17 But it's okay to be a shareholder? 0 18 Α I think in many cases it does give 19 a common interest in the company. I am not a 2.0 shareholder, by the way. 21 0 And you said -- you mentioned 22 vendors. So, to be independent, a director 2.3 should not be employed by a vendor; is that 24 what you mean? 25 I would suggest that could possibly 26 compromise them. And as you know, FERC has a 27 rule about Board members not serving on a

utility Board as well as a Board of a vendor.

2.8

| 1 | I think anything that might even |
|----|---|
| 2 | create the perception of compromised |
| 3 | decision-making would be considered under the |
| 4 | independent definition. |
| 5 | Q Okay. I want to delve into this a |
| 6 | little more by looking at a passage from |
| 7 | page 4-9, beginning on line 7. And I am |
| 8 | going to read that. It says: |
| 9 | The directors of PG&E, in |
| 10 | my experience, have taken |
| 11 | into account impacts on |
| 12 | customers and other |
| 13 | stakeholders as we have |
| 14 | discharged these fiduciary |
| 15 | duties. Directors must be |
| 16 | free to consider and |
| 17 | balance all such |
| 18 | considerations in an |
| 19 | unbiased fashion and must |
| 20 | avoid conflicts of interest |
| 21 | that could impair their |
| 22 | ability to do so. |
| 23 | And then it goes on. Do you see |
| 24 | that? |
| 25 | A I do. |
| 26 | Q So, you mentioned in the passage |
| 27 | "fiduciary duties." And earlier in that same |
| 28 | paragraph you had stated that the Board |

members have a fiduciary duty to act in the 1 2 best interest of shareholders; is that 3 correct? That is correct. А That is the 4 commonly-held definition and I believe the 5 law. 6 7 Right. I was just going to ask That is a legal duty? 8 9 Α Yeah. 10 Now you do not have a similar 11 fiduciary duty to customers; is that correct? 12 Α I believe a fiduciary responsibility to shareholders means that we 13 14 do everything possible to deliver value to 15 the customers, to the communities and to 16 other stakeholders. That's particularly true I think in a utility where both the economy, 17 18 but the very well-being of individuals in a 19 community is part of that duty. 2.0 Okay. And I am going to repeat my 21 question which was a yes or no question. You 22 do not have a fiduciary duty as a director to 2.3 customers; is that right? 24 As it's defined in the law, yes. Α 25 0 Okay. Yet you say the Board takes 26 into account impacts on customers and other 27 stakeholders and should do so in an unbiased

fashion. So the question that raises for me

How do you take customer considerations, 1 interests into account without bias when your fiduciary duty is to the shareholders and you 3 don't have such a duty to the customers? If I'm not serving the customers, 5 6 if I have a massive failure in safety as we 7 have seen, if the people who purchase my services and pay my bills are not satisfied, that has a direct translation into the 9 10 financial well-being of the company. 11 other words, the stock price declines significantly when you have ignored these 12 fundamental responsibilities. So I think 13 14 it's -- you asked the question honestly as if 15 they're mutually-exclusive and I don't 16 believe that's actually a reflection of how 17 it works. 18 0 Okay. But doesn't fiduciary duty 19 mean that if there is a conflict between 2.0 customer interests and shareholder interest, 21 then you have to put the interests of shareholders first? 22 2.3 Α I can't imagine a situation in 2.4 which a conflict -- we have not been 25 presented with one, nor have I ever candidly on the boards that I have served. 26 27 Let's think about this issue.

Whether shareholders should pay for billions

2.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

of dollars of wildfire liability or should try to recover those costs in higher rates paid by ratepayers, do you not see a potential tension or a conflict of interest between the position of shareholders there and the interests of customers?

A I think in our case, the shareholders have actually offered to pay a significant amount. I think it depends honestly on the determination of those kinds of events.

Q Let's divorce it from the particular, the Plan of Reorganization here and just talk generally about a situation that could arise and it could be a gas explosion. It could be anything where there's an issue about whether or not PG&E is -- whether shareholders are paying for the costs or whether they're seeking the reliability costs that result from an incident, or whether those costs are requested to be recovered from ratepayers. Do you not see that there is a potential for a conflict there?

A Perhaps there is a potential for a conflict. I don't feel that potential and I think it is very dependent on circumstances, on the regulatory compact, on what rules

under which people are operating and the 1 consistency of those rules. So I understand 2. why you might perceive that. I just haven't 3 had that experience at this point. 4 Let me ask you another 5 6 hypothetical. Let's say that there's a 7 director on the PG&E Board that is an avowed customer advocate. I am going to put 8 9 customer interests first, first. Would that be a conflict of interest? 10 I'd like to believe that all of our 11 Δ Board members are customer advocates. 12 have seen a lot of demonstrations of that in 13 14 Board decisions. 15 And so if that person said on this 16 matter, "I am going to put the interests of customers ahead of the interests of 17 shareholders," would that person have a 18 19 conflict of interest? 2.0 I am -- honestly I don't believe as Α 21 I have said these are mutually exclusive. 22 Okay. I understand your position. 0 We don't need to --2.3 24 Α Okay. 25 I am not trying to cut you off. 0 26 realize the question was getting a little 27 repetitive and I just wanted to move on. 28 So let's talk about a slightly

1 different issue on page 4-23 of your 2. testimony. And this -- they're going to be echoes of what we have just been talking 3 about, I acknowledge. 4 5 Α That's all right. But it is slightly different. 6 0 This 7 is Section E-1. And this is about how the goals of safety and financial performance 9 relate to each other. 10 Δ Mmm - hmm. 11 0 Do you see that section I am talking about? 12 13 Α I do. 14 I think your position is that 15 safety and financial performance are not 16 conflicting goals; is that right? 17 Α That's correct. 18 Now are you saying then that it is 0 19 not even possible for those goals to come 2.0 into conflict? I don't see a set of circumstances 21 Α 22 in which that would happen. Safety would 2.3 always, always be first because it's an 24 underlying element of financial performance 25 and you can see that in the stock price of 26 PG&E or any other company that has had a 27 major safety issue. 2.8 Okay. So, I don't know if you're Q

aware TURN has recommended that PG&E 1 2. directors be required to agree in writing that if shareholder interests and safety come 3 into conflict that safety takes priority. 4 5 Do you have a problem with that recommendation by TURN? 6 7 Α I'd have to think about that. T am aware of the recommendation, but we could 8 9 also sign something that says if fiduciary 10 responsibilities and reliability came into 11 conflict or sustainability or environmental 12 stewardship, all of those are underpinnings 13 of a successful company and therefore its 14 financial stability and performance. 15 So I understand why you would like 16 that. I just would have to have a better 17 understanding of how one would define that. I believe we're held accountable to a 18 standard of performance, particularly when 19 2.0 you're elected year by year. So I appreciate 21 that suggestion and I'm happy to take it 22 under consideration. I can't make that 2.3 commitment without a fuller understanding of what that would actually mean. 2.4 25 Well, with all respect, this was 26 the proposal that we put in our December 13th 27 testimony. We have asked PG&E about it in

data request responses and we have gotten

nothing but evasion. And so I was hoping you 1 would give me an answer. And I am sorry but 2. it sounds like you're still not able to 3 answer the question of whether you would agree with that recommendation. 5 I understand the recommendation. 6 Ι 7 respect the recommendation. I need to understand the implications of that before I 8 commit an entire board. 9 10 Now, in terms of whether safety and 0 financial performance can ever come into 11 12 conflict, I assume you are aware that leading up to the San Bruno explosion there was, and 13 14 this is what the Commission identified as 15 part of the problem, that there was an 16 excessive focus on financial performance to 17 the detriment of doing the work that was 18 necessary to have a safe gas infrastructure. 19 Are you familiar with that? 2.0 I'm familiar that. San Bruno was a 21 call to action for the entire pipeline 22 community whose recordkeeping had not kept 2.3 up, whether that was -- whether that was illustrated preference for financial 24 25 performance and not spending necessary 26 capital, or whether it was simply an 27 inexcusable oversight. I do know it caused

an entire industry to rethink and also check

2.8

on their own records, because I was on the 1 2. pipeline board at the time. 3 Q But my question is: Are you ready, can you accept, or do you agree that part of 4 5 what happened there was that PG&E emphasized financial performance to the detriment of 6 7 safety? If the Commission determined that, 8 I accept the Commission's definition. 9 10 think there are a lot of things that can go 11 wrong with recordkeeping. And I've seen some of them, none of which have to do with not 12 spending adequate financial resources to 13 14 support the core mission of the company. 15 0 Okay. I'm going to move on to a 16 new topic, which you've raised a couple of 17 times. You've talked about compensation for 18 executives? 19 Α Yes. 2.0 \bigcirc I want to talk about it at a very 21 high level now. I know there is another 22 witness who is going to go into the details. 2.3 I'm going to ask you from a high-level board 24 perspective. 25 Α Yes. Actually, if you could look at 26 27 page 4-4, the last bullet you have on that

page about how the Board fulfills its roles.

28

| 1 | Let me know when you are at 4-4. |
|----------|---|
| 2 | A I'm there. |
| 3 | Q The last bullet says one of the |
| 4 | ways for the Board to fulfill its roles is to |
| 5 | hold the CEO and management accountable for |
| 6 | results. Can we agree that one way the Board |
| 7 | can do that is through executive |
| 8 | compensation |
| 9 | A Absolutely. |
| 10 | Q One type of executive compensation |
| 11 | is incentive compensation? |
| 12 | A That is correct. |
| 13 | Q As opposed to foundational or base |
| 14 | pay? |
| 15 | A That is correct. |
| 16 | Q For the incentive compensation |
| 17 | portion, would you agree that where the |
| 18 | achievement milestones qualify for the |
| 19 | incentive compensation, where they are set is |
| 20 | very important? |
| 21 | A Absolutely. |
| 22 | Q And what would happen if those |
| 23 | achievement miles milestones were too easy |
| 24 | to achieve? |
| 25 | A I think the Board would not be |
| | |
| 26 | fulfilling its responsibility to hold |
| 26 27 | fulfilling its responsibility to hold management accountable. |

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

situation if the milestones were set such that they could be so easily achieved that effectively the incentive compensation becomes quaranteed conversation? That would not be a good thing; is that right? It is not incentive compensation under those circumstances. Okay. Finally, I would like to 0 direct you to page 4-32 of your testimony, lines 21 and 22. Α Yes. 0 There you are referring to PG&E's execution of the PSPS events in October 2019 as, the word you use is "imperfect." Now,

Q There you are referring to PG&E's execution of the PSPS events in October 2019 as, the word you use is "imperfect." Now, earlier in your testimony you say that the Board is responsible for setting the tone at the top. You are the Board chair. Is that the right word to capture what went wrong with PG&E's shutoffs last October?

A I think there is no word to actually describe the impact of the things that went wrong during that period of time.

I was in the EOC. I was working with the teams to find quick solutions. It is why we spent the time since then with a number of work streams to address those issues.

It is among the reasons, but there were many that the compensation committee,

| 1 | and John Lowe can testify to the details, has |
|----|---|
| 2 | readjusted the compensation to focus on |
| 3 | safety, to focus on including a submetric on |
| 4 | PSPS. |
| 5 | Q I'm just curious why you couldn't |
| 6 | have chosen a phrase like "poorly executed" |
| 7 | instead of a word like "imperfect"? |
| 8 | A I accept your recommendation. |
| 9 | "Poorly excused" would be absolutely a good |
| 10 | term. |
| 11 | MR. LONG: That is all my questions. |
| 12 | Thank you. |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 14 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Long. |
| 15 | Mr. Strauss. |
| 16 | MR. STRAUSS: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 17 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 18 | BY MR. STRAUSS: |
| 19 | Q Ms. Brownell, my name is Ariel |
| 20 | Strauss. I represent Small Business Utility |
| 21 | Advocates, a nonprofit that represents small |
| 22 | businesses and other small commercial |
| 23 | customers. |
| 24 | A few moments ago you said |
| 25 | something to the everybody that you could not |
| 26 | imagine a serious conflict between safety and |
| 27 | financial performance. Is that roughly |
| 28 | correct? |

| 1 | A That is correct. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q And yet we are all here today |
| 3 | because there is some sort of serious |
| 4 | oversight in safety that resulted in |
| 5 | bankruptcy? |
| 6 | A I agree with that. |
| 7 | Q Okay. And in the transition to |
| 8 | increase focus on safety, is there a |
| 9 | heightened risk that certain core |
| 10 | competencies may be overlooked in that |
| 11 | transition? |
| 12 | A Could you clarify what core |
| 13 | competencies you might |
| 14 | Q Sure. Other social services and |
| 15 | other essential areas of businesses that PG&E |
| 16 | must ensure are adequately addressed. |
| 17 | A No. I don't think it is not our |
| 18 | intention nor do I think it is necessary to |
| 19 | improve our safety record, to improve our |
| 20 | operational performance while ignoring |
| 21 | certain other constituencies or obligations |
| 22 | that we have. If that answers your question? |
| 23 | Q Not exactly. |
| 24 | A Okay. |
| 25 | Q What I'm asking is, there is a |
| 26 | finite amount of resources available, finite |
| 27 | number of people on the Board. They are very |
| 28 | busy people. I understand that you are |

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

saying they will spend more time field, they
will be transitioning more responsibilities
to the SNO Committee. In that environment,
is there a heightened risk that certain other
responsibilities could be overlooked?

A I don't believe so. And we can
talk about specifics. If you want to talk
about our commitment to the small business
community, we've had a good relationship.

Q That is all right. Thank you. I
think that answers the question.

A Okay.

Q Then I guess it would be fair to say -- have you had any meetings then that address managing risks of other areas that are being overlooked that are not safety?

A I've had several meetings with our customer group about a number of different constituencies. How we might not only continue to serve them, but serve them better. I've also had a number of visits with customers in the field, particularly those who are impacted by PSPS, to get a better understanding of how we can accommodate their needs and will continue to do that. I think that is an important part of the board's role.

Q Okay. Then can I draw your

attention to the skills matrix on 4-11, 4-12? 1 2. Let me know when you are ready. I'm there. 3 Α The skills matrix includes a long 4 0 5 list of important skills. One of them I see, for example, is large-scale customer 6 7 experience, but I don't see anything to do with small business customer experience; is 9 that correct? 10 Δ That is correct. But let me 11 suggest this. By "large-scale customer 12 experience, " and we may have been inarticulate, this is a work in progress. 13 Ι 14 think we met with customer, major 15 customer-facing experience, could be small 16 business, could be the big industrials that 17 are also represented here. We have customers of all sizes. 18 19 was a small business lender. We were number 2.0 one SBA lenders in our region for the 10 21 years I was at the bank. I'm a small 22 business owner. So I can appreciate the 2.3 perspective, how important and often 24 neglected the small business community is. 25 So with that perspective, I have 26 heard that the change in the Board 27 constituency may have been 70 to 80 percent

in the last few years. Would you know if the

Board level experience with respect to small 1 businesses has increased or decreased or 2. stayed the same? 3 I would be happy to get back to you 4 with that. I don't have the answer. 5 6 haven't really looked at the skills matrix or 7 the experiences of the previous board. Okav. I'm going to turn now to a 8 9 question that was asked by Mr. Abrams to Mr. Johnson. And I'll read it from the 10 11 transcript. My question isn't about if you 12 are familiar with the transcript, but I think 13 it will help set the right tone. 14 Α Okay. 15 The question is: Are there skills 16 that you feel -- this was the question from 17 Mr. Abrams -- are the skills that you feel 18 are not as well represented on the Board that 19 you think should be there? 2.0 Mr. Johnson's answer was: That is 21 a good question. I'm not going to answer it. 22 My answer is that Chair Nora Brownell will be available. 2.3 24 Now, would you like to answer that 25 question? I think we've added several. 26 Sure. 27 We've added wildfire experience, mitigation

experience. We actually added in the past

the customer experience. We've added network 1 2. experience, which is how we got Bill Smith from -- former AT&T executive. I think 3 customer experience, as I said. We've also 4 added experience with labor relations. 5 6 In the interest of time, however, 7 the question though is: Are there skills that are not represented on the Board? 8 9 Α I actually think that while 10 we have some restructuring experts who have 11 made a huge contribution. We are moving --12 when we emerge into a period where we need someone who has led a major transformational 13 14 experience, whether it was an industry 15 changed by technology, whether it was an IT 16 turnaround, I really think we are going to 17 need that experience going forward. 18 Well, I appreciate that response. 0 19 That leads me into my next question, which is 2.0 about the change in responsibility, shift in 21 responsibility from the public policy 22 committee to the SNO committee. Now, I see 2.3 that a lot of added responsibility being 24 shifted, wildfire and PSPS events in

particular. How is that being managed with the low responsibility that already exists in the SNO committee?

A Is your question are they

2.8

resourced? Are they well enough resourced to 1 2 handle that? For instance. 3 Α Yeah. We will certainly make sure. 4 First of all, CCP, SNO and audit actually 5 6 have all worked very closely together. All 7 of the committees have, but those three particularly. So the transition will be 8 9 orderly with the identification now that CPP 10 has had some experience of the kinds of 11 resources they need, the kinds of focus they 12 need to have any additional support they may 13 need, either internally or externally. 14 ALJ COOKE: What does CPP stand for. 15 THE WITNESS: Compliance and Public 16 Policy. 17 ALJ COOKE: Thank you. 18 THE WITNESS: I think I'm going to get 19 that right. 2.0 Who have also begun a very important 21 initiative I can talk about later. 22 BY MR. STRAUSS: 2.3 Then, along those same lines, we Q 24 heard from Mr. Vesey about the importance 25 with respect to safety of certain types of 26 compliance reporting and certain types of 27 recordkeeping. How do you disentangle the 2.8 roles and keep those clear between the

2.8

compliance side, which I understand is still 1 2. on the Compliance and Public Policy Committee, and SNO Committee 3 responsibilities? 4 I think we are, and I hope this is 5 6 responsive to your question, we are 7 developing a matrix, the beginning of which is just in its infancy, is in -- under 33 of 8 9 the exhibits. And that is to keep a running tab on all of the commitments that we have 10 11 either made through settlements, through 12 regulatory changes, through judicial orders, to make sure that we are tracking those. 13 14 there may be overlap with safety and other 15 kinds of compliance. 16 So, again, we want to make sure 17 that everyone, the Commission, intervenors, 18 employees, everyone understands the 19 commitments we've made so we can hold 2.0 ourselves accountable. But also, and I think 21 this is very important when you are making 22 rules and commitments, are those rules and 2.3 commitments achieving the desired outcome. 24 I've been involved in 25 transformations and rulemaking for a long And I know that at the FERC we made a 26 time. 27 lot of market rules that we realized were not

as effective as we wanted them to be in

changing behaviors in the marketplace. 1 So I 2 think this will be a course of cross-functional information and tracking. 3 Again, those committees work very 4 closely together and will continue to do so 5 for the foreseeable future. 6 7 Then to avoid the risk of anything falling between the cracks, what process or 8 9 procedure do you expect to have in place to do that? 10 11 Α Again, we are collectively working 12 within the company to gather in one place everything that we have committed to. 13 14 So I've met the other day with the 15 compliance folks from a number of different 16 parts of the company to get this project, let's say, moving a little faster than it has 17 18 We will do regular review of that at 19 the Board meeting to make sure we are keeping 2.0 We will also build a database that track. 21 will be able to be updated and corrected, 22 should it be needed. 2.3 Okay. I just have a couple more 0 24 questions. 25 Α Sure. One of them has to do with 26 27 something that Mr. Long raised, which is that 2.8 while the shareholders can move on, the

2.8

customers, given it is a utility monopoly, 1 2. are here for the long run. Is there anything in place that ensures that the safety 3 commitments are being made now won't be 4 changed in the future? 5 6 Α Well, I think once you've 7 committed, been ordered by a judge or a regulator, or committed in a settlement and 8 9 there will now be a public document that we 10 can all agree on and track, it would be very 11 difficult without giving some justification 12 to either change, which you couldn't arbitrarily do, nor would you want to. 13 14 might in collaboration with others, like the 15 Commission, say we think this would be a 16 better way to go about that. 17 In terms of mechanisms and not any 0 18 mechanism proposed to be in place to give it 19 priority to these changes? 2.0 Α I don't know what mechanism might 21 be better than having an ongoing, living 22 document that is reviewed by the Board and 2.3 the management. I'm not sure what other --24 I'm sorry. What is that document? O 25 It is a document, it is in Tab 23. А 26 We are just developing it. Because I said I

would like a list of all the commitments that

we have either made voluntarily in a

1 settlement, have been ordered by the 2. Commission, have been legislated or have been 3 ordered as part of the judicial proceeding. I want them all in one place. I want to 5 understand who owns that particular 6 obligation. So that is -- that is a tool of 7 accountability that we've imposed in a number of areas, including some audit issues. 9 have an owner, we have the cost, we have the 10 obligation. And we will begin to track about 11 what problem that is beginning to serve. 12 is not a document that is by any stretch of 13 the imagination complete. But that will 14 be -- allow everyone, and we will certainly 15 make that public when we are confident that 16 it is accurate, and it will be updated and 17 public. And I think there is no way better 18 way to hold people accountable than a little 19 sunshine on what you've committed to do. 2.0 Then you envision this process will 21 develop actual specific commitments? 22 This is a list of commitments we Α 2.3 have made. 24 And the commitments will be in what 0 25 in what document, for instance? 26 ALJ COOKE: Can I interject here? Ιt 27 looks to me like Tab 23 that Ms. Brownell is referring to is in PG&E-6, and it is 2.8

```
4-EXH.23-1, until the end of that section.
 1
     It is in PG&E-6.
           THE WITNESS:
                         I would --
 3
           ALJ COOKE: Exhibit 23.
 4
               (Crosstalk.)
 5
 6
           THE WITNESS: You are a better woman
 7
     than I.
               I want to say it is in its infancy.
 8
 9
     I don't want to give this out as a finished
10
     and complete document. This is beginning of
11
     our desire to have a tracking mechanism so
12
     that we can hold ourselves accountable, but
13
     we can also measure outcomes.
                                     We've talked a
14
     lot about outcomes at various hearings here
15
     at the Commission, and I think that is
16
     important.
17
     BY MR. STRAUSS:
18
           Q
               What I would like to point out is
19
     that this process doesn't inherently
2.0
     establish any document that will identify
21
     what the commitment is.
                              It makes the
22
     determination -- as I understand it, the
     Commission makes the determination that PG&E
2.3
     is in compliance. But what it sounds like
2.4
25
     you are saying is there is going to be a
26
     document that will identify those
27
     responsibilities as undertaking to maintain
2.8
     compliance and to maintain organizational
```

in place.

structure that prioritizes safety? 1 That is correct. 2. Α I object to the form of 3 MR. WEISSMANN: the question. At least I'm getting very 4 confused about what kinds of commitments we 5 6 are talking about. 7 ALJ COOKE: I think we should move on from this line of questioning. I think she has described the document as an infant 9 10 document, and you can ask a more specific 11 question. It is a little bit vague as well. 12 BY MR. STRAUSS: 13 My last question with respect to 14 Ms. Kane in her role, what processes are in 15 place to ensure that the person in that role 16 has -- is independent and there is not 17 interference with the reporting processes? 18 I think she is established as 19 reporting regularly to both the Board, and 2.0 she is in our board meetings and the 21 committees. Her job description in and of 22 itself, I suspect, will describe the need for 2.3 The fact that she is a regular independence. part of discussions, and the head of CPP 24 25 particularly and SNO meet with her regularly 26 without any interference from anybody, I 27 think suggests that that process is already

| 1 | Q So then my last my actual last |
|----|---|
| 2 | question now, follow-up. The Deputy General |
| 3 | Counsel designation, what is the reporting |
| 4 | role in that fashion? |
| 5 | A I'm honestly not sure I understand |
| 6 | the question. |
| 7 | Q I see there is a title here Chief |
| 8 | Ethics and Compliance Officer and the Deputy |
| 9 | General Counsel. I think I understand what |
| 10 | Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer means. I |
| 11 | assume I'm sure there is a General |
| 12 | Counsel? |
| 13 | A There is a General Counsel. |
| 14 | Q Would it mean that this person is |
| 15 | also the Deputy General Counsel? |
| 16 | A It means that she has the authority |
| 17 | over compliance in ethics and reports in the |
| 18 | law department, because this is a legal issue |
| 19 | and a legal position. |
| 20 | Q Would she then report to the |
| 21 | General Counsel? |
| 22 | A She would report to the General |
| 23 | Counsel. |
| 24 | MR. STRAUSS: Thank you. That is all. |
| 25 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Let's be off |
| 26 | the record. |
| 27 | (Recess taken.) |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |

1 record. At this time, we will turn to 2. 3 cross-examination by Mr. Abrams. CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. ABRAMS: 5 6 0 Good afternoon. I want to start 7 with picking up where some of the other questions left off, specifically around where 8 9 the interest of shareholders and the interest 10 of customers diverge. 11 I am a wildfire survivor, as they call in bankruptcy a "victim." Would you 12 agree that victims' interests as customers 13 14 have largely diverged from the interest of shareholders? 15 16 Α First of all, let me say I know 17 what you survived, and it has been horrific 18 and I can't imagine. 19 But no, I don't actually see where 2.0 they've diverged. Maybe you can be more 21 specific in an example? 22 Sure. Yeah. I'll move on, and I 2.3 think I'll try to illustrate that in a 24 question as I go through here. 25 Do you see tying investor return 26 more specifically to safety as a goal of the 27 Board? 2.8 As I've said, I think there are a Α

number of underlying factors in the financial 1 2 success of a company and its ability to pay shareholders. And safety is first and 3 foremost among them for a utility. Frankly, 4 should be for any company, but specifically 5 6 for a utility. So I think they are tied 7 together, because an unsafe company, as this company has experienced, is unable to pay 8 shareholders. 9 10 So since the bankruptcy occurred in 11 2000 have you provided payments to shareholders? 12 We have at the low end of the 13 14 utility spectrum. I looked at that a couple 15 of weeks ago. 16 Do you not agree that the deferred Q 17 maintenance across your infrastructure has 18 not occurred? 19 MR. WEISSMANN: I'm sorry. I object to 2.0 the form of the question. I got lost in the 21 negatives. ALJ COOKE: I did too, to be honest. 22 2.3 MR. ABRAMS: I'll rephrase the I apologize. 24 question. 25 Deferred maintenance, do you believe that deferred maintenance across the 26 27 infrastructure has occurred? 2.8 Α I think there are a number of

| 1 | issues that have affected the safety |
|----|--|
| 2 | performance of this company. It certainly |
| 3 | has been found that deferred maintenance, |
| 4 | vegetation management, as well as |
| 5 | dramatically different climate conditions, |
| 6 | have affected the performance. |
| 7 | Q Okay. With all due respect, I'm |
| 8 | asking your opinion. I know that is what has |
| 9 | been found. I'm asking do you agree that |
| LO | deferred maintenance across the |
| L1 | infrastructure has occurred? |
| L2 | A I agree that it has, in some |
| L3 | instances, occurred. |
| L4 | Q Do you not see that as evidence |
| L5 | that investor interests and short-term yield |
| L6 | has been provided without putting those |
| L7 | investments into the infrastructure? |
| L8 | A I actually can't say that |
| L9 | conclusively. I think among the issues that |
| 20 | I see are inadequate inspections. For |
| 21 | example, we now know and are using more |
| 22 | extensively technology to inspect our |
| 23 | infrastructure. Some of the visual |
| 24 | inspections simply were not adequate to |
| 25 | determine the actual conditions. So we are |
| 26 | making changes in |
| 27 | Q I appreciate that. I'm not asking |
| Ω | about inspections right now If I can I'm |

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

just asking about a very specific thing. Let me rephrase, because I know a part of it may be how I'm asking the question. I'm not an attorney. I'm not used to this.

A Neither am I, and nor am I.

Q All right. Basically what I'm asking is: There is a million dollars that the company, PG&E, can do with. They can either choose to put all or some as a return to their investors, or they can put all or some into replacing C-hooks or putting in more covered conductors.

And do you not see that sometimes those trade-offs could be compromised? And do you not see that that was part of the contributing factors to the current state of things?

A I'm going to try and answer your question because it's more complicated than that. I have not seen evidence that tradeoffs as you suggest to pay investors over investing in infrastructure or safety have occurred. But let's consider that the utility model in this country and others was developed to attract long-term inexpensive capital. In order to continue to do that, companies paid dividends. As I said, this company relative to its utility peers has

paid for quite some time at the low end of 1 2. the spectrum, now is not paying at all. What I see is not merely deferred 3 maintenance but inadequate maintenance that 4 5 is not necessarily driven by a willingness to 6 invest or not invest. It's driven by a number of factors. I will let -- go ahead. I appreciate that. I I am sorry. know there's lots of factors. Again, I am 9 10 just trying to focus on this one factor, 11 which is clearly I think and you have stated, 12 that deferred maintenance is at least part of 13 the equation. I am not saying it solves 14 everything because there are lots of other 15 issues. What I am asking is: Is that not --16 part of the issue, is that in some cases 17 investor interest, as you said, attracting 18 those investors and keeping those investors 19 has been more of a priority than replacing C 2.0 hooks that have failed or jumpers that have failed or all of the infrastructure that is 21 22 related to failures and fires and loss of 2.3 life and loss of structures, that that is not 24 part of the problem of PG&E? 25 Objection. Asked and MR. WEISSMANN: answered. 26 27 ALJ COOKE: Agreed. Please move on to 2.8 the next question.

BY MR. ABRAMS:

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

Q I think it was -- so part of what you stated earlier was that the reason why shareholder interests and the interests of customers are aligned are because when there's a big fire those interests come together.

Do you not agree, and I appreciate that I'm also asking a double negative -- do you not agree that waiting for fires and penalties has been ineffectual in terms of creating change for PG&E?

A I don't think PG&E nor its employees are waiting for fires. I don't think -- I think one could argue, and it has been argued that PG&E was not as fast in responding to what clearly were the impacts of climate change. So I think they were slow to follow San Diego Gas & Electric's example, which is a really good one. And I visited them. My employees have visited them. But I think to suggest that anyone was waiting for a fire to change behavior doesn't represent what I've seen.

Q So when you describe that investor interests and customer interests are aligned because fires are something that is to the detriment of both investors and customers,

```
are there things that are more leading
 1
     activities that are aligned with those
 2.
     interests, rather than the fires or the
 3
     penalties?
 4
           MR. WEISSMANN: Objection to the form
 5
     of the question.
 6
 7
           THE WITNESS: I don't understand the
 8
     question.
           ALJ COOKE: I don't think I understand
 9
10
     the question as well.
11
           MR. ABRAMS: All right. I will
12
     rephrase.
13
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Thank you.
14
     BY MR. ABRAMS:
15
               My understanding and you can
16
     correct me if I'm wrong was that you
17
     described the interests of shareholders and
18
     the interests of customers as aliqued because
19
     both of them of course don't want to have
2.0
     fires occur. And what I'm asking are: What
21
     are the other ways, prior to those fires
22
     occurring, when you are coming to the dollars
2.3
     and cents of things? Are those interests
24
     aligned through the actions of the
25
     corporation?
26
               I am going to give it a shot,
27
     Mr. Abrams, but I am still not sure I
2.8
     understand.
```

| 1 | Q Thank you. All right. |
|----|---|
| 2 | A Well-managed companies have a |
| 3 | greater likelihood of attracting financial |
| 4 | investment. That only that certainly in |
| 5 | this case, one of the things investors look |
| 6 | at is our safety record. But well-managed |
| 7 | companies also have strong performance in |
| 8 | many ways, have clear transparent financials, |
| 9 | have strong data, have good customer ratings. |
| 10 | There are a lot of measures, all of which are |
| 11 | important, and many of which concern |
| 12 | customers. |
| 13 | So, I don't think if I am |
| 14 | grasping your question, wildfires or safety |
| 15 | issues are certainly the most paramount and |
| 16 | certainly the biggest commitment that we |
| 17 | have. There are many things that can go |
| 18 | wrong in a company. |
| 19 | Q Thank you. |
| 20 | A Does that get there? |
| 21 | Q Yeah. I appreciate that. Let me |
| 22 | do a follow-up. |
| 23 | A Okay. |
| 24 | Q So companies where there's a |
| 25 | competitive environment drives success |
| 26 | because you want to beat out your |
| 27 | competition. |
| 28 | In PG&E, a monopoly, you can call |

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

it a natural monopoly, those competitive pressures don't exist to that extent. How do you create the incentives for a company that doesn't have to innovate their C hook, because if they don't do it their customer will beat them out. How do you provide incentives that that becomes a priority as opposed to what the incentives are in the competitive space?

A Well, first of all, I am a big believer in markets but this is a natural monopoly and the origin of the regulatory system in our county is to superimpose that -- what would be competitive pressure. It's a challenge, having been a regulator, I can tell you, but the fact of the matter is when you have natural monopolies that are so critical to communities, it's really important to have that regulatory compact and that regulatory structure.

But there are lots of ways. There are lots of ways that companies are incented to do the right thing. Again, I have spent time with our employees and the pride that they take in doing the job that they do. I think it is commendable, particularly under the circumstances in which they have been operating, but I think it behooves the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

company to give adequate tools, adequate 1 2. training, pay people for performance, make sure the metrics are clear, but also make 3 sure the metrics are reasonable. If you have a limited amount of time to do an inspection, 5 6 you might be a little more casual than you 7 wanted to. Any company, however, has to allocate capital according to what they determine is its needs. 9

One of the things we're working on is a better asset management understanding and better data so we can manage those assets more carefully and with a greater positive outcome for our safety record.

- Q So, the allocation of capital to its needs and regulatory proxies for the competitive marketplace --
 - A Among others.
 - Q Among others?
 - A I listed a lot.
- Q Do you not see that part of what could be done in this Plan of Reorganization and the regulatory structure that could come out of it is to tie more-specific regulatory controls over the allocation of capital so that the public can understand and trust that PG&E is going to spend that allocated capital towards the things that are around our safety

28

as opposed to other areas that the business 1 2. might want to put those resources towards? Well, first of all, again having 3 Α been a regulator, it puts the regulator in a 4 5 tough position. You're asking them to 6 effectively manage a company and I am not sure that's a role they would choose -- well, 7 I am not sure that's a role that's 9 appropriate nor one that they would choose to 10 play. 11 A company can be held accountable 12 for how it manages and I think the Commission 13 has done that and continues to do that as do 14 others. 15 So I think deciding how a company 16 allocates its capital is probably not the 17 right answer. The right answer is to have a 18 management team in place with well-trained 19 employees who are incented to do the right 2.0 thing. And I have never seen a decision in 21 this company where people purposely make a 22 choice to put safety as a secondary 2.3 commitment. I haven't seen it. We may not 24 have been artful. We may not have been 25 efficient. We may not have done as many 26 things done as we would like, but the reality

And capital is allocated according

is it is and will remain a priority.

to need and there are asset management 1 structures, again which we're trying to 2. improve, to look at the fundamental 3 components of our assets. 4 5 So are you not aware of the 6 falsification of documents that has occurred 7 within PG&E? I am aware of the falsification of А 8 9 documents. So was that intentional? 10 \bigcirc 11 Α I wasn't -- I cannot speak to what 12 employees chose to do or not to do. 13 I thought you just -- sorry, but I 14 thought you just stated for the record that 15 you were not aware of employees doing 16 intentional things to the detriment of the 17 company and safety? 18 You're asking me to assign a 19 motive. I am aware that employees have 2.0 I am absolutely aware of falsified records. 21 I cannot tell you what motivated them 22 to do that. I thought you were suggesting motivation. 2.3 24 So, through the investigations into 25 those incidences, as the Chair of the Board, 26 what have you found as the motivations of 27 those employees? 2.8 I am trying to -- there have been Α

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

one incident since I've been there and I can't tell you what the motivation was. I can't tell you. I think they were terminated because we can only have zero tolerance for people who intentionally falsify records.

Why they falsified records, I can't tell you.

Q Do you not think it's the Board's responsibility to understand what might have motivated staff to falsify records so it does not happen again?

A Absolutely. And I can't answer that question. So there are a variety of things that can motivate people to make the wrong choice. They felt under pressure, you had the wrong metrics, you didn't have the right tools, people didn't understand. It's a paper-driven system and people actually make mistakes, but I am not a psychiatrist. So I can't tell you why individuals choose to make the wrong choices. I just can't tell you that.

Q I know there's a whole host of reasons why that could occur, but I also have worked for a lot of companies. And when there's a transgression like that, typically there's an investigation and part of that investigation would say, "What motivated this, so it doesn't happen again?"

| 1 | And are you saying that nothing |
|--|--|
| 2 | like that has occurred or that the Board |
| 3 | thought to investigate, not in general all |
| 4 | the plethora of things or become a |
| 5 | psychiatrist and try to understand what was |
| 6 | in people's heads, but clearly there was some |
| 7 | evidence that you could look to, to |
| 8 | understand what drove that activity so you |
| 9 | could ensure that it doesn't happen again. |
| 10 | Doesn't that make sense and fit within the |
| 11 | purview of the Board? |
| 12 | A It does and perhaps I was not |
| 13 | clear. In every instance there is an |
| 14 | investigation, in absolutely every instance. |
| | |
| 15 | In every investigation, there is an |
| 15 16 | In every investigation, there is an attempt to determine why people did what they |
| | |
| 16 | attempt to determine why people did what they |
| 16 17 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various |
| 16 17 18 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. |
| 16 17 18 19 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will (Crosstalk.) |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will (Crosstalk.) ALJ COOKE: You can't talk over one |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will (Crosstalk.) ALJ COOKE: You can't talk over one another. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will (Crosstalk.) ALJ COOKE: You can't talk over one another. MR. ABRAMS: I apologize. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will (Crosstalk.) ALJ COOKE: You can't talk over one another. MR. ABRAMS: I apologize. ALJ COOKE: Okay. Please continue, |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | attempt to determine why people did what they did. And I have given you the various reasons. Q I will (Crosstalk.) ALJ COOKE: You can't talk over one another. MR. ABRAMS: I apologize. ALJ COOKE: Okay. Please continue, Ms. Brownell. |

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

which one it is, nor might I have all of the details at hand. I am giving you a picture of the results of a number of investigations about which I, a Board member and others, have been made aware, and the Board has taken steps to address some of those issues.

For example, we found metrics that gave too limited of time to inspect, as I said earlier, transmission towers. So we've said that is not really a good metric. The number that you do a day is perhaps not a good metric. It may suggest to people that they need to ignore certain things, not file reports on certain things.

Another very common thing that we found is when people are using paper, they not only make mistakes, they make choices in filling out that are not adequate to determine -- to create an appropriate record.

So we're deploying more and more tablets and I have asked them to escalate that deployment so that you will have templates where you have to fill out a form accurately or you -- you have to answer each question within a certain range of answers. You can't say "n/a" or you can't go on.

So I am just giving you some samples. Are there people who --

| 1 | Q Sorry. |
|--|---|
| 2 | A Sorry. Go ahead. |
| 3 | Q I appreciate that. I am not really |
| 4 | looking for samples. If this is the answer |
| 5 | to my question, that's fine. But what I am |
| 6 | asking is for these I mean, it's been |
| 7 | clearly reported out, right, that there were |
| 8 | falsifications of documents. |
| 9 | So for those specific instances, |
| 10 | not in general a sample of what could |
| 11 | possibly happen, was it time for those |
| 12 | incidences, time pressures and the fact that |
| 13 | it was on paper that caused them to be |
| 14 | motivated to falsify documents? |
| | |
| 15 | MR. WEISSMANN: Wait, wait. I am |
| 15 16 | MR. WEISSMANN: Wait, wait. I am going to admonish you not to divulge |
| | |
| 16 | going to admonish you not to divulge |
| 16 17 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. |
| 16 17 18 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 16 17 18 19 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you gave, Ms. Brownell, of just a moment ago, |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you gave, Ms. Brownell, of just a moment ago, were those examples from a particular |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you gave, Ms. Brownell, of just a moment ago, were those examples from a particular proceeding that the Commission has before it |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you gave, Ms. Brownell, of just a moment ago, were those examples from a particular proceeding that the Commission has before it or has recently resolved? |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you gave, Ms. Brownell, of just a moment ago, were those examples from a particular proceeding that the Commission has before it or has recently resolved? THE WITNESS: I honestly, I can't tell |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | going to admonish you not to divulge privileged information. THE WITNESS: Okay. ALJ COOKE: In the example that you gave, Ms. Brownell, of just a moment ago, were those examples from a particular proceeding that the Commission has before it or has recently resolved? THE WITNESS: I honestly, I can't tell you. |

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

28

754 February 28, 2020 1 issues. 2. ALJ COOKE: Okay. I think that each set of specific violations or charges in 3 particular enforcement proceedings are part 4 5 of the enforcement proceeding itself. 6 here we are focused on is the government's 7 role for purposes of emerging from 8 bankruptcy. 9 So can you -- one more shot at 10 getting the answer that you're looking for, 11 Mr. Abrams, related to this topic and then 12 let's move on to the next question. 13 MR. ABRAMS: Sure. 14 THE WITNESS: We'll get there. 15 MR. ABRAMS: I am not sure we will, 16 given the response from counsel. 17 But we are here to discuss how PG&E 0

resolve bankruptcy and come out with a safety-oriented culture. Any corporation that I have been associated with, part of the safety culture is transparency. Part of the transparency is investigating -- a proper investigation before you're legally obligated to do so, to find these answers and provide transparency so that the public can have more trust in the corporation that you're not going to burn our houses down any more.

So this goes to that central point.

2.8

For these specific instances, are you able to 1 2. tell us the investigation and the motivations associated with those personnel that you have 3 been able to find out and ascertain? 4 5 Mr. Abrams, we always do an investigation. 6 So let me just be very clear 7 about that. The results of those investigations are reported to various committees of the Board and the Board itself. 9 We examine the causes of what drove 10 11 people to do -- to the extent that they have 12 acknowledged and by the way, people don't To the extent that we --13 always acknowledge. 14 they have acknowledged and we have examined, 15 I have given you the range of reasons that 16 people give us. I can't say that anyone has 17 ever said, "I purposely set out to lie to 18 you." So what did you take away from 19 2.0 those investigations in terms of a changed 21 culture? What did you do as an action to 22 ensure that PG&E wouldn't have any more falsification of documents? 2.3 24 The Board has worked with Α 25 management to do a variety of things, 26 including as I have mentioned, setting more

appropriate metrics, giving people technology

that will make it easier for them to do their

2.8

jobs and easier for them to report accurate 1 2. data, holding people --3 Q Okay. А I am not finished. Holding people 4 5 accountable even though traditionally when 6 people are terminated we might be grieved, we 7 just have to have zero tolerance. And the fourth thing I would say 8 9 and there are lots, is better training, 10 having people understand the import of their 11 behaviors. 12 Thank you. You mentioned that 13 there's wildfire mitigation experience that 14 has been added to the Board. Can you 15 describe that wildfire mitigation experience? 16 Α It's been recently added to the 17 matrix which has been a work in programs. We 18 are working with two search firms, one of 19 which is giving job descriptions for the 2.0 Non-Gov Committee and the Board to review. So I don't have a fulsome 21 22 definition of that at this moment in time, 2.3 but we will have a job description. 24 So currently that does not exist on Q 25 the Board? It does not exist on the Board. 26 Ιt 27 does exist on our Safety Advisory Committee

that is headed by Chris Heart. We have a

former CAL FIRE, I think he's a Battalion 1 2. Chief, who has been added to that, and they're advising both management and the 3 Board. 4 And I know you're new to your 5 6 position, so do you think it was not a 7 failure prior to your arrival that they didn't recognize due to the many fires that 8 9 they needed to ensure that someone who had 10 that experience was on the Board prior? 11 Α I really don't feel comfortable 12 passing judgment on people when I wasn't 13 there. 14 Q No problem. Thank you. 15 You mentioned that you were looking 16 to bring someone who would be able to provide 17 major transformational experience. 18 Given that Mr. Johnson stated in 19 his hearing in this hearing room, that his 2.0 role was not to inspire but to just provide 21 purpose, how do you expect with him in that 22 role that you're going to get 2.3 transformational and inspiring leadership in 24 PG&E? 25 Objection. MR. WEISSMANN: That 26 mischaracterizes Mr. Johnson's testimony. 27 MR. ABRAMS: I believe it's directly

quoted from Mr. Johnson. He stated, "It's

2.8

not my role to inspire. I can give purpose." 1 2. MR. WEISSMANN: He went on to provide a lot more testimony on that topic. 3 ALJ COOKE: The witness can answer to 4 the best of her ability. 5 I am not going to comment 6 THE WITNESS: on what Mr. Johnson said. I wasn't there and 7 I haven't read the transcript. Although I 8 9 have seen the leadership he has provided in 10 employee meetings and I would call it 11 transformational even if he would not, or 12 inspirational. What I am talking about is 13 attracting someone to the Board who has been 14 through major transformation of an industry. 15 So I came from banking to the 16 Pennsylvania State Commission and I was 17 recruited specifically because I had been 18 through the transformation of the banking 19 industry and they were going through 2.0 restructuring in Pennsylvania. 21 So I think it would be helpful and 22 by the way this is me, we are still working 2.3 on the matrix, I might get outvoted but I don't think so, that I think it would be 24 25 hugely helpful to get somebody who has been 26 through, for example, a major IT 27 transformation; major transformation because of the technology changes, not what has 2.8

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

February 28, 2020 happened, for example, in the healthcare 1 2. industry. Are there examples, because I 3 appreciate that -- are there examples of 4 5 corporations that you can point to that have 6 been through a bankruptcy and arose that you feel are like examples for PG&E and how you 7 can overcome these obstacles? 9 Α You know, that's a good question. 10 And off the top of my head, I am actually not 11 able to come up with that, but it would be a 12 conversation I would be happy to have. I have looked a lot at what it 13 14 takes to be a transformational leader and I 15 have looked at industries where, in fact you 16 see it happening right now at G&E as they restructure themselves, not having been 17 18 through bankruptcy, but I would have to 19 really think about that. But it's a 2.0 thoughtful question. 21 Thank you. 22 Thank you. If there is, as you 0

stated a mass failure in safety, do you feel like that that is a lagging indicator of performance?

Object to the form of MR. WEISSMANN: the question. I don't remember her using the term "mass failure in safety."

```
1
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Can you point us to where
 2.
     that comes from, Mr. Abrams?
                        It was stated in earlier
 3
           MR. ABRAMS:
 4
     testimony.
 5
           MR. WEISSMANN:
                           Objection.
 6
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Can you rephrase your
 7
     question, Mr. Abrams?
           MR. ABRAMS:
                        I'll just skip the
 8
 9
     question. I made note of it when she said
10
     it, but I will move on.
11
               So as a victim, I am soon to
12
     become, if this Plan of Reorganization comes
     through, part of a major shareholder class of
13
14
     Pacific Gas and Electric. I described this
15
     issue with Mr. Wells and asked his opinion on
16
     it and I will ask you the same:
                                       Ιf
17
     shareholders are now -- these major
18
     shareholders are now also customers, rates
19
     when they change, increased rates, given the
2.0
     wide price elasticity associated with a
21
     natural monopoly increases in rates benefit
22
     shareholders, but they do not benefit
     customers to have increased rates because it
2.3
24
     affects affordability. So how do you see
25
     that playing out with the next fire or the
26
     next need for capital? How do you see that
27
     playing out in terms of the tear for a
     wildfire victim who wants to see return on
2.8
```

their investment while at the same time 1 2. looking to make sure rates are low? Objection to the form 3 MR. WEISSMANN: of the question. 4 The question got a little 5 ALJ COOKE: long for me. My coffee has worn off. 6 Could 7 you try to shorten it a little bit? MR. ABRAMS: Absolutely. It was 8 9 long-winded. So I fully admit. 10 0 Raising rates, I am now a 11 shareholder victim customer. I have 12 interests as my -- as a shareholder for 13 increasing rates so that I get a greater 14 return on my investment. As a customer, I 15 want lower rates and my neighbors want lower 16 rates. How is that going to be treated now 17 that you have this new 21 percent shareholder 18 class within PG&E? 19 I am not sure I entirely 2.0 understand. But I understand inherently that 21 you feel perhaps a conflict. 22 First of all, we do not go in for 2.3 rate increases in order to give greater 24 returns to shareholders. We go in for rate 25 increases, and the Commission is pretty disciplined about this, to be able to fund 26 27 needed expenditures to serve customers reliably, safely and affordably and certainly 2.8

I know that they take all of those into 1 2. consideration. So the premise of your question, I 3 think is one which we are probably just not 4 5 on the same page. And yet as a shareholder, 6 you may or may not choose to continue to own 7 that stock. That's a possibility. Those were settlements to which I was not -- with which I was not involved. So the outcome I 9 10 think would best be discussed with the people 11 who negotiated them. 12 Okay. So you're aware that in the 13 year 2000 PG&E also was in bankruptcy? 14 Α I am aware of that. 15 Are you aware upon the exit of 16 bankruptcy, Commissioner Loretta Lynch at the 17 time stated: I think we are moving -- we are 18 in a more -- we are more vulnerable than 19 ever. 2.0 Does this give you the sense that 21 we have been here before? 22 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Lacks foundation. We don't know the context of 2.3 that remark. 2.4 1 25 ALJ COOKE: I agree. It does lack 26 foundation. But I think the question can be 27 answered to the best of the witness's 2.8 ability.

I knew Commissioner THE WITNESS: 1 2 Lynch, and we worked together to resolve many of the market issues that were facing 3 California, along with the infrastructure 5 issues. But I honestly don't know why she 6 said that. So it is hard to answer. The circumstances of that bankruptcy 7 were entirely different than this. So it may 8 9 not be apples to apples. I don't feel, given 10 the bankruptcy process and the rigor with 11 which bankruptcy judges manage those, they 12 would have emerged from bankruptcy with the 13 concept that they were weaker. So I think --14 I'm just, you know, I don't know why she 15 thought that. 16 BY MR. ABRAMS: 17 Are you aware that after that 0 18 bankruptcy the chairman at the time, Robert 19 Glynn, Jr., was awarded 17 million, and 2.0 Gordon Smith received \$10 million? Are you 21 aware of that? 22 MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Foundation 2.3 and relevance. 24 The relevance is -- or, sorry. 25 ALJ COOKE: You can explain what you 26 think the relevance is, then I'll rule. 27 The relevance is I'm trying to 2.8 understand if those types of things will be

done with this bankruptcy. 1 2. ALJ COOKE: The objection is sustained. You can ask that question. 3 #08: 4 Okav. Will those types of awards be 5 provided postbankruptcy this time around? 6 7 We've recently redone our compensation plan, which is part of our plan 8 9 of reorganization, which I believe has both 10 short-term and long-term metrics that are 11 clearly associated with safety. And I can 12 assure you both the compensation committee 13 and the Board have the authority to reduce --14 to reduce anything that they see fit, based 15 on a catastrophic safety event, or any kind 16 of major event that would lead one to 17 conclude they had not behaved appropriately 18 or responsibly. 19 I actually have been involved in a 2.0 situation on a board where we reduced 21 compensation because of a safety incident. 22 So I wouldn't hesitate to do so. I don't envision that. 2.3 24 Are you aware through this 25 bankruptcy the victim class was the only one 26 being compensated with shares? 27 Again, as I said, I did not 2.8 negotiate that settlement. So I think that

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

question -- I am aware of it, but I think how 1 2. it came to be and why it came to be is best left to those who were at the negotiating 3 table. I know that there were legal 5 representatives. I would encourage you to have that conversation. 6 7 0 I understand you are aware. As the chair of the Board, do you think it is fair that the entrenched 9 10 investors were not compensated with shares, 11 but that victims are given stake in a company that burned their homes down and decimated 12 13 their lives? 14 Α As I acknowledged to you earlier, I 15 understand your discomfort, perhaps distaste, 16 certainly can understand that. I did not 17 negotiate that arrangement. And I think the 18 answer to your question, I think while I'll 19 acknowledge kind of maybe some of the ethical 2.0

dilemma or discomfort you may feel, I didn't negotiate it. So I can't really comment.

Have you been familiar at all with the letters that have been coming in from victims into the bankruptcy court docket?

> I've read about them, yes. А

Okay. Have you understood from those letters that they go well beyond discomfort with that agreement?

| 1 | A I understand this is a very |
|----|---|
| 2 | emotional topic, I understand the inherent |
| 3 | conflicts that people feel. And I recognize, |
| 4 | you know, the feelings are raw here. This is |
| 5 | a people have been through horrible |
| 6 | things. So I'm certainly aware of what |
| 7 | they've said, and I'm sure the judge will |
| 8 | consider it. |
| 9 | But, again, I have to tell you, Mr. |
| 10 | Abrams, I was not involved in that |
| 11 | settlement. And I think you would really be |
| 12 | better served to have this conversation with |
| 13 | the people who were. |
| 14 | Q I'm not having a conversation about |
| 15 | it. I'm asking you your opinion as the chair |
| 16 | of the Board. Do you think it is fair, is |
| 17 | the question. |
| 18 | MR. WEISSMANN: Objection. Asked and |
| 19 | answered. |
| 20 | MR. ABRAMS: It was not answered. |
| 21 | ALJ COOKE: It was answered to the best |
| 22 | of her ability. Next question, please. |
| 23 | MR. ABRAMS: Okay. |
| 24 | Q You indicated in your testimony |
| 25 | that you are an independent board chair. I |
| 26 | know you described this a bit earlier. But |
| 27 | is there anything you would like to elaborate |
| 28 | on regarding how the Board is independent? |

I could lax eloquence, I'm sure, 1 Α 2. for a long time. I'm not sure on a Friday 3 afternoon people want to hear that. I am very comfortable, let me say 4 this with absolute certainty, that the Board 5 individually and collectively is acting in 6 the best interests of what they call the 7 "estate in bankruptcy," which includes a lot 9 of things. So I am very comfortable with the 10 behavior and commitment to the Board -- of 11 the Board, excuse me. Let me state, in case it wasn't 12 apparent, I'm not looking for a job through 13 14 this question, but I will ask it anyway. 15 has been recommended by some that you 16 consider having a wildfire victim represented on the Board. Is that under consideration? 17 18 А Not at this moment. 19 On page 4-4, line 19 of your 2.0 testimony, you state: Holding the CEO and 21 management accountable for results is a primary objective. 22 23 Can you describe the degree to which the Board has had success with this 24 25 over the past few years? 26 I can't speak to the Board for the 27 past few years, because I've been here what

seems like a lot of years, but it has been

2.8

2.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

2.8

almost less than a year.

Have we had success? I think we have a good working relationship with the CEO and management. I think we are agreed that we want to drive change. I think the Board has been very clear about certain things, like the pace of change, which we would like to see increase about the need to focus on certain specific business practices, which we feel need to be improved, particularly to support better safety operations like the data issue. And I'm not talking merely about the data that you were referencing earlier in terms of recordkeeping. I'm talking about our overall ability to integrate and manage desperate data systems, because we are not getting the full picture of what we want. Which is why we are about to engage a well-known firm that has solved this asset management problem in a large way by the airlines industry, who also do a lot of work for government, and have worked for some big telecom companies, with whom we've spoken.

Q On page 4-6 -- and I see your counsel checking the time, so I'm going to try to move quickly -- on page 4-6, line 1 through 4, you indicate diversity is important, then you talk about gender

2.8

diversity. How are you looking to get other 1 2. diversity, economic, racial and other types of diversity, on the Board? 3 Certainly that is part of our 4 refreshment process. So we have in fact made 5 a commitment to increase the number of 6 7 Californians. But I'm always committed. We have five women now, we want to increase 9 that. We have some demographic diversity 10 that -- or ethnic diversity that I think we 11 certainly want to maintain, if not enhance. 12 When you read the too many board 13 attachments that I have from experts, from --14 and investors, from best corporate practices, 15 the issue of diversity of experience, 16 diversity of background is critically 17 important. And I myself have had the benefit 18 of that with people coming from different 19 business experiences, having different 2.0 skills. I think we've all been enhanced by 21 this process. I certainly would want to 22 maintain that for the future. 2.3 So it is currently -- let me ask 0 2.4 So it is currently not a goal of the 25 Board recruitment process to have economic 26 diversity folks who have a low-income 27 background, or racial diversity, having more

black representatives on the Board?

It is the goal of the Board 1 Α 2. refreshment process to focus on the skills that have been identified in that matrix 3 because, first and foremost, that is 5 important for the appropriate oversight. 6 certainly we want as much diversity as we can 7 and that bring those skills. It is how we got five women and the current ethnic diversity that will continue to be a focus. 9 10 Okay. At the bottom of page 4-17 Q you indicate that a board must be agile. 11 12 What do you mean by "agile"? "Agile" in -- there is a couple of 13 Α 14 different ways. First of all, "agile," in 15 the terms of this board, is that you need to 16 the have adequate time. You really need to 17 be prepared to spend a lot of time. That may 18 not seem like agile, but I think it is. 19 Secondly, you need to prioritize 2.0 and reprioritize as concerns change, as rules 21 change, as regulations change, as technology 22 changes. That is one of the things that I 2.3 think the utility industry has been 24 challenged by, just in my experience. That 25 isn't maybe a view universally changed, 26 shared. But I think we need to be quicker to 27 adapt new ways of doing business. I think we need to look at, for example, other 2.8

2.

2.3

businesses. Not every utility is a leader in every business practice. So I think you need to look outside the normal course of business. So there is a lot of different ways.

Q Thank you.

You mentioned in earlier testimony that you've changed some of your procurement practices, and now you are expecting to have an RFP before you sign the contracts. Part of what I understand through this process that is occurring right now is in a lot of ways similar to that.

My question is this: Is asking the Commission, parties in this room, victims who are currently being solicited for their vote prior to a plan even being inked, premature? And like you have asked to change your procurement processes to have the RFPs first, should we not be looking at having a solid, finished plan before we are having this type of proceeding?

A I think we are working very hard,
A, to provide a comprehensive, robust plan.

People may differ on how robust, or certain elements of that plan. But I think we are all striving to get -- emerge from bankruptcy as soon as possible, because we want to pay

2.8

the victims. I think that is driving -- I 1 2. think that is why everyone is focused on that June 30th date. 3 So in a perfect world, or in many 4 5 bankruptcies, this bankruptcy would go on for 6 But no one believes that is in the best interest of the victims, of the state of 7 California, of the customers and of the 8 9 company itself. 10 You don't think there are people that feel like this is a rushed process? 11 12 I'm sure there are people that feel Α 13 this is a rushed process. Everyone is 14 entitled to their opinion, Mr. Abrams. 15 Q Thank you. 16 Α I'm simply telling you that, first and foremost, while transforming a company, 17 18 we also want to make sure that victims get 19 paid. 2.0 Would you not expect that, like an 21 RFP, we should be looking at measurable 22 things that might be like an SLA, a service 2.3 level type agreement, baked into this plan of 24 reorganization so that we aren't reliant upon 25 subjective measures that we actually have, 26 specific metrics tied to investor return,

tied to executive compensation so that we no

longer have to trust this time around that

PG&E will do the right thing? 1 2. MR. WEISSMANN: Object to the form of 3 the question. ALJ COOKE: The witness can answer to 4 the best of her ability. 5 Well, I think you've 6 THE WITNESS: 7 already seen a compensation plan that has very clear objective metrics according to --8 9 and very specifically, actually, we started 10 to do that before 1054 and the Commission's 11 proceeding. But we are trying to have 12 verifiable objective metrics that are tied to 13 safety and all the metrics under safety. 14 There are a lot of things that we 15 can all ask for, but we need to remember that 16 this is a business. And if there are too 17 many limitations and too many rules, 18 particularly rules that are a challenge to 19 enforce or who are not -- that are not well 2.0 understood, we really won't attract -- the 21 goal is ultimately to attract the long-term 22 investors that you had before, the CalPERS, 2.3 the CalSTERS, the Vanquards. Nobody seems to 24 like the hedge funds. Well, we need to 25 attract those long-term investors. 26 put too many restrictions that are not 27 understood, or do not lead to a company that is held accountable but is run like a 2.8

```
business, I think you limit the
 1
 2
     opportunities.
               But, again, reasonable people can
 3
     disagree on what they want to see in the
 4
 5
     plan.
 6
           0
               Yes.
                     Thank you.
 7
           ALJ COOKE: Just as a time check. You
     have just under five minutes.
 8
 9
           MR. ABRAMS: Okay. I will make sure I
10
     adhere to that. Thank you.
11
               Do you understand the difference
12
     between activity metrics and
     performance-based metrics?
13
14
           Α
               I do.
                      I think I do. I should.
15
               All right. Do you feel that the
16
     Board should be making sure that throughout
     the company there are performance-based
17
18
     metrics and that ties to compensation and not
19
     activity-based metrics on the whole?
2.0
           Α
               Couldn't agree with you more.
21
           MR. ABRAMS: Thank you. I'll leave it
22
     there. Thank you.
2.3
           ALJ COOKE:
                       Thank you.
24
               Commissioner Rechtschaffen, you had
25
     a few questions?
           COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I do.
26
27
     Thank you.
     ///
2.8
```

| 1 | EXAMINATION |
|----|---|
| 2 | BY COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: |
| 3 | Q Ms. Brownell, thank you for your |
| 4 | testimony. Nice to see you again. |
| 5 | A Nice to be back. |
| 6 | Q Do you have a view about how |
| 7 | regionalization, how PG&E's operation could |
| 8 | improve safety? |
| 9 | A Commissioner, I think we are in the |
| 10 | earlier stages of planning. I have been on |
| 11 | the Board of National Grid, which has a |
| 12 | regional structure. It is done state by |
| 13 | state. And I think if you build in the right |
| 14 | structure, if you build in the right metrics, |
| 15 | it can and should. But, overall, I think the |
| 16 | stated goal of regionalization is to get |
| 17 | closer to the customer, admirable, you know, |
| 18 | all those things. |
| 19 | I think changing safety has to be |
| 20 | an enterprise level initiative. I'm really |
| 21 | pleased that we are finally getting a Chief |
| 22 | Safety Officer who brings vast industrial |
| 23 | experience so that we can operationalize and |
| 24 | really drive down metrics that change safety. |
| 25 | So regionalization can. I can't |
| 26 | say, my current understanding of the plan, |
| 27 | which is very early stages, that it |
| 28 | necessarily will. I'm not being vague. I'm |

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

saying I think it is a desirable goal. I think it depends on how you structure it and how it is executed.

I also think that enterprise wide, we can't have pockets of different metrics and different perceptions in the same way we've changed our operating risk management system instead of at a very granular business based, you know, bureau by bureau, director. It is event based and much more broadly understood and able to be measured. I don't want to lose sight of that. There are benefits to regionalization, there are challenges.

Q Just a follow-up. When you said there are "pockets," you just referred to pockets of the company that don't follow the same metrics. I'm not sure I totally understand.

A I was actually talking about risk.

So I was probably confusing apples and oranges.

We've moved to a better system of risk management. Previously, it was done at bureau level. Different businesses viewed risk and measured risk differently. In order to effectively measure risk, you have to have an agreement enterprise wide on what those

risks are.

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

So the same thing is true of safety. I think you have to have a company-wide commitment and understanding of safety. And to do that, you have to have a change leader at the top. Now, there are different safety metrics in gas and electric. I'm not getting that specific. But I think in other to everybody change, you have to have a sustained commitment at a very senior level with an experienced person. And I think our incoming Chief Safety Officer has that, to really drive a dynamic in the company that just hasn't been there.

Q I wanted to ask you a follow-up question to -- about your view that you need transformational elements on the Board. And Mr. Abrams asked you about that as well.

Just so I understand what you are suggesting, is it that transformational experience should be, or restructuring experience should be one of the factors that are considered for all board members or some board members, or there should be one or two people with that expertise?

A Sure. And let me distinguish between what I see as restructuring experts. And we have restructuring experts who have

made a terrific contribution. 1 They are 2. familiar with bankruptcy, they are familiar 3 with different financial aspects of 4 bankruptcy. But a transformational leader I'm 5 thinking of someone who has been in an 6 7 industry where seismic changes has occurred. You could even say somebody from Amazon, I'm 9 not suggesting we are talking to anybody from 10 Amazon, the earlier stages, but somebody who 11 has seen a different way of serving 12 customers, who knows what it takes. Having a monopoly, Mr. Abrams is right, we tend to 13 14 lose sight of the customer. We talk a lot 15 about customers, but we tend to lose sight 16 and not touch customers in the way a 17 competitive business might. 18 I'm talking about somebody who has 19 been through IT transformation. That is a 2.0 really, really complicated thing to 21 accomplish, but we have to do that. Somebody 22 who has been through a technology change, an 2.3 industry that is being changed by technology. 24 I think a person who has that, a couple, but 25 that wouldn't be the only skill. Does that 26 help? 27 Yes. You answered my first 28 question.

2.

2.0

2.3

2.4

2.8

A Okay.

Q Now I'll follow-up with a second question, which you've been discussing. But is it your view that it should be someone who has been in an industry that has gone through transformation, because the utility industry is certainly going through a transformation, or somewhere who has transformed a company from one point to another? In other words, what do you think the biggest need is for PG&E?

A Well, the utility industry has been undergoing a transformation for as long as I've been in it. When I look at other transformations, it is taking kind of a long time. So I wouldn't necessarily say someone who has transformed the energy industry. I'm thinking maybe of banking, of maybe IT, of maybe retail, who also brings that customer experience. Not etched in stone. We are developing job descriptions, as I said. But I think it would add value and bring a different perspective.

Q You said that the Board has authority to reduce compensation based on a catastrophic event, and you've exercised that on another board?

A I have.

Do you happen to know if the 1 2 compensation of any PG&E executive was reduced as a result of the 2017 or 2018 3 wildfires? 4 I don't know. 5 А I'm sorry. 6 0 I have one last question for you. 7 This relates to the Independent Safety Oversight Council. I'm trying to figure out 8 9 where it fits in with everything else. 10 have a Chief Risk Officer, a Chief Safety 11 Officer, Safety and Nuclear Oversight 12 Committee, a soon-to-be independent Safety Officer and an Independent Safety Oversight 13 14 Council; is that correct? 15 Δ That is correct. 16 Q And are you sure --17 Α We are going to get it right one 18 way or the other. 19 Well, I'm trying to figure out 2.0 if -- are some of those functions 21 duplicative? 22 I actually don't think they 2.3 I think the ISOC, who's reporting to 24 the corporation CEO, also producing reports 25 that will be used throughout the 26 organization, gives just that outside 27 perspective. The Chief Risk Operator is 2.8 going to be responsible for identifying the

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

rules, identifying the needs, identifying the technologies and operationalizing them, making those part of the system.

Chief Risk Officer has the responsibility for enterprise risk, safety being one of them, but a massive asset failure being another, a massive IT -- so there are different kinds. So they identify the risks at an enterprise level. They create the risk register. We are using currently what is commonly accepted at most companies is a bow tie analysis.

If there were safety issues recognized on that risk register, that would inform both the Safety Committee as well as the Chief Safety Officer. And let me give you one good example of kind of how that information goes back and forth. On our open audits list, when we got there, there were a -- too many actual safety-related, open operating audits that had gone on too long and had no owner identified. The audit committee, which is typically populated by financial folks, said we are not fully able to kind of understand these, rationalize these to strive change.

SNO in the audit committee, who ultimately has responsibility, but SNO in the

audit committee worked very carefully 1 2. together to make sure, number one, they fully understood the risks that those open audits 3 presented, drove closure to those while also 4 5 assigning accountability. So there is no audit now that doesn't have an owner 6 7 assigned. Accountability is about identifying the owner. 8 9 So I think those are actually kind 10 of integrated and -- but one is -- several 11 are SNO's oversight. The other have specific 12 responsibilities 13 And the relationship between the 14 Independent Safety Council and SNO is what They're both external to the 15 exactly? 16 operating part of the company. 17 Α The ISOC is an advisory Right. 18 board that advises management but also whose 19 reports will go to SNO to see if there's 2.0 anything, for example, that they recommend. 21 And there's a remarkable similarity, by the 22 way, between what the ISOC has recommended in 2.3 its recent report and what NorthStar has 24 recommended. Some of these things are 25 already underway. SNO drives that, though. Okay. Thank you. 26 So has the ISOC 27 prepared any reports so far? 2.8 Α They have just completed. I think

| 1 | it's relatively recent, yeah. |
|----|---|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Okay. |
| 3 | Thank you. |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |
| 5 | Mr. Weissmann, is there any |
| 6 | redirect? |
| 7 | MR. WEISSMANN: If I could have just a |
| 8 | moment, please. |
| 9 | ALJ COOKE: Off the record. |
| 10 | (Off the record.) |
| 11 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 12 | record. |
| 13 | Mr. Weissmann, did you have any |
| 14 | redirect? |
| 15 | MR. WEISSMANN: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 16 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 17 | BY MR. WEISSMANN: |
| 18 | Q You were asked some questions about |
| 19 | the reporting relationship of the Chief |
| 20 | Ethics and Compliance Officer. Do you wish |
| 21 | to clarify your testimony on that topic? |
| 22 | A I do. Julie King reports to Bill |
| 23 | Johnson, our CEO. While she does have a |
| 24 | legal function for purposes of investigations |
| 25 | and all of those things, she reports to the |
| 26 | CEO, which is an important distinction. I'm |
| 27 | sorry I missed that. |
| 28 | Q You made some comments about the |
| | |

extent of the Commission's role in deciding 1 2. how to allocate capital. 3 Can you elaborate on your understanding of the Commission's role in 4 5 that regard with respect to capital to be 6 spent on the Wildfire Mitigation Plan? 7 Α That's not fungible. So I Yes. did not mean to suggest the Commission has no 9 role. They very specifically directed 10 allocation and we would absolutely respect that. 11 12 Okay. You were asked some 13 questions about the use of activity-based 14 metrics and incentive compensation. Are you 15 aware of whether the long-term incentive plan 16 as proposed by the company includes activity-based metrics? 17 18 It does, with apologies to 19 Mr. Abrams. It does, but I think the primary 2.0 focus and the direction that the Compensation 21 Committee is taking is more outcome-based 22 metric. 2.3 That's all I have, your MR. WEISSMANN: 2.4 Honor. 25 ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. 26 Mr. Abrams, do you have any recross 27 as a result of these redirect questions? 2.8 MR. ABRAMS: No. I do not, your Honor.

| 1 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. STRAUSS: Your Honor, if I may, I |
| 3 | believe that one of questions was in response |
| 4 | to my question. |
| 5 | ALJ COOKE: My apologies. I thought we |
| 6 | had done that already. Go ahead. |
| 7 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 8 | BY MR. STRAUSS: |
| 9 | Q With respect to responsibility of |
| 10 | Ms. Kane, are you saying that her reporting |
| 11 | authority differs based on the role that she |
| 12 | is playing in the organization? |
| 13 | A No. I am not. I was referring to |
| 14 | the fact that her title Deputy Counsel |
| 15 | General Counsel suggests she does have legal |
| 16 | responsibilities but she reports for all |
| 17 | purposes to the CEO of the corporation, Bill |
| 18 | Johnson. |
| 19 | Q And for the purpose of clarity, she |
| 20 | does not report to General Counsel? |
| 21 | A No, she does not. That was my |
| 22 | correction. Sorry. |
| 23 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |
| 24 | Any redirect, Mr. Weissmann? |
| 25 | MR. WEISSMANN: No. |
| 26 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |
| 27 | Thank you for your testimony, |
| 28 | Ms. Brownell. You're excused. |

| 1 | Let's be off the record. |
|----|---|
| 2 | (Off the record.) |
| 3 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be on the record. |
| 4 | Mr. Abrams has asked to renew his |
| 5 | request for a ruling on a motion. |
| 6 | Go ahead. Please renew that |
| 7 | request. |
| 8 | MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 9 | I would like to renew my request for |
| 10 | public participation hearings, given that the |
| 11 | TCC has not engaged in this proceeding and |
| 12 | the voices of victims have been largely |
| 13 | absent from the proceeding. I think it's |
| 14 | important we hold public participation |
| 15 | hearings and we actively seek the engagement |
| 16 | of victims and the questions they have around |
| 17 | this Plan of Reorganization. |
| 18 | ALJ COOKE: And it's my understanding |
| 19 | that you have filed a written motion along |
| 20 | these lines. |
| 21 | MR. ABRAMS: Yes, I have, your Honor. |
| 22 | ALJ COOKE: Okay. Thank you. And I |
| 23 | will bring it back to the attention of the |
| 24 | Administrative Law Judge and the assigned |
| 25 | Commissioner and await their ruling on that |
| 26 | motion. |
| 27 | MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 28 | ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. |

| 1 | At this time, we will begin with |
|----|--|
| 2 | cross we will call to the stand Ms. Hogle |
| 3 | on behalf of Pacific Gas and Electric |
| 4 | Company. |
| 5 | Ms. Hogle, please stand and raise |
| 6 | your right hand. |
| 7 | JESSICA HOGLE, called as a witness |
| 8 | by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, having been sworn, testified as |
| 9 | follows: |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 11 | ALJ COOKE: Thank you. Please be |
| 12 | seated and state your name and place of |
| 13 | business for the record. |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: My name is Jessica Hogle. |
| 15 | My place of business is PG&E Corporation. |
| 16 | ALJ COOKE: Okay. Thank you. |
| 17 | Mr. Weissmann. |
| 18 | MR. WEISSMANN: Actually my colleague |
| 19 | Teresa Reed Dippo will examine. |
| 20 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. |
| 21 | (Off the record.) |
| 22 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the |
| 23 | record. |
| 24 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 25 | BY MS. DIPPO: |
| 26 | Q Ms. Hogle, do you have in front of |
| 27 | you PG&E prepared testimony Volume 1, which |
| 28 | has been marked as PG&E-1? |

| [| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | A Yes. | | | | |
| 2 | Q Can you turn to Chapter 9 of that | | | | |
| 3 | testimony, please? | | | | |
| 4 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be off the record. | | | | |
| 5 | (Off the record.) | | | | |
| 6 | ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the | | | | |
| 7 | record. | | | | |
| 8 | BY MS. DIPPO: | | | | |
| 9 | Q Are you sponsoring Chapter 9 of | | | | |
| 10 | that testimony, page 1 line 1 through page 16 | | | | |
| 11 | of line 12? | | | | |
| 12 | A Yes. | | | | |
| 13 | Q Was that chapter prepared by you or | | | | |
| 14 | under your direction? | | | | |
| 15 | A Yes. | | | | |
| 16 | Q Have there been any updates or | | | | |
| 17 | corrections to that chapter? | | | | |
| 18 | A No. | | | | |
| 19 | Q Is your testimony true and correct, | | | | |
| 20 | to the best of your knowledge? | | | | |
| 21 | A Yes. | | | | |
| 22 | MS. DIPPO: Ms. Hogle is available for | | | | |
| 23 | cross-examination. | | | | |
| 24 | ALJ COOKE: Mr. Strauss. | | | | |
| 25 | MR. STRAUSS: Thank you, your Honor. | | | | |
| 26 | CROSS-EXAMINATION | | | | |
| 27 | BY MR. STRAUSS: | | | | |
| 28 | Q Ms. Hogle, my name is Ariel | | | | |

26

27

2.8

I am counsel to Small Business 1 Strauss. Utility Advocates on behalf of the interests 2. of small business and small rural and 3 commercial customers. 4 I am sorry to bring you here just 5 for this one question, but my question is: 6 7 In light of the wildfires and the release of greenhouse gases from those fires and the 9 diminishment of vegetation by those fires, 10 has PG&E adjusted its greenhouse gas 11 emissions mitigation programs to account for 12 that? So I think I will say that the best 13 14 way to address greenhouse gas emissions from 15 wildfires is to prevent wildfires from 16 occurring. There's a chapter, on Chapter 6, 17 that describes all the actions that were 18 taken for that. 19 Beyond that as it relates to 2.0 meeting climate goals, California has very 21 stringent climate goals in place. PG&E is 22 committed to meeting those goals. This plan 2.3 puts us on good footing to be able to 24 continue to do that.

So, we will meet the, you know, 80 percent reductions below-1990 levels by 2050 and the related renewable portfolio standards requirements of those goals.

```
Thank you. I will note that as a
 1
           0
 2.
     no, as a response to my question?
               I am not aware of any specific
 3
           Α
     activities to account for wildfire emission.
 4
     I am aware of what we are doing going
 5
 6
     forward.
 7
           MR. STRAUSS: Thank you. That is all,
 8
     your Honor.
 9
           ALJ COOKE: Okay. Is there any
     redirect, Mr. Weissmann? I am sorry,
10
11
     Ms. Dippo?
12
           MS. DIPPO:
                       No.
           ALJ COOKE: All right. That was quick.
13
14
               Thank you for your testimony today,
15
     Ms. Hogle. You are excused.
16
               Let's be off the record.
17
               (Off the record.)
18
           ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the
19
     record.
2.0
               While we were off the record, we had
     a brief discussion. We will reconvene on
21
22
     Monday at 9:00 a.m.
2.3
               The preliminary set of witnesses,
24
     and we will have further discussion on that,
25
     is that the first witness that will be up is
26
     witness Kane followed by a panel of three
27
     people that are sponsoring Chapter 6 of
2.8
     volume -- of Exhibit PG&E-1, Powell, Pender
```

2.

2.0

2.3

2.8

and Maratukulam and then Ms. Yap, who has a date-certain for CLECA, will be completed on Monday.

We will add some people to it just to know the order for the -- starting on the order for the next -- rest of the week. We also have a few statements of counsel that are follow-ups that I had requested over the course of the last day or so.

Mr. Weissmann.

MR. WEISSMANN: Thank you, your Honor.

First a question was raised about the various capital structure adjustments that PG&E is proposing and those appear in PG&E-7, on pages 2-22 and 2-22-A. So this is just to explain -- this is the amendment to Mr. Wells' testimony that addresses the three adjustments to the capital structure that are being requested.

Second, a request -- a question was raised a to whether the bridge loan commitment for PG&E Corporation is in the record. We had a discussion about the utility bridge loan. The answer is no. The PG&E Corporation bridge is not in the record because we're not seeking approval for it since it's not a utility obligation. It is, however, a public document that has been

filed with the Bankruptcy Court. 1 2. Third of all, a question was raised 3 I believe by Commissioner Rechtschaffen or 4 maybe it was you, I am sorry, as to the list 5 of the 2017 and 2018 fires that appears in the Plan of Reorganization as Exhibit A, and 6 7 the Plan of Reorganization has been filed in the docket. 8 9 Fourth, Commissioner Rechtschaffen 10 asked a question about whether there had been 11 any reduction in incentive compensation as a result of the 2017 and 2018 fires. 12 would report that in 2018 the Board decided 13 14 not to pay anything on the short-term 15 incentive program. 16 ALJ COOKE: All right. Thank you. 17 Let's be off the record. (Off the record.) 18 ALJ COOKE: Let's be back on the 19 2.0 record. All right. This concludes our business for 21 22 today. Thank you, everybody. It's been a 2.3 very long day and I appreciate people being 24 as concise as they could be in their 25 questions and answers. 26 With that, today's evidentiary 27 hearing is adjourned. And we will reconvene 2.8 on Monday at 9:00 a.m.

| 1 | Off the record. |
|----|--|
| 2 | (Whereupon, at the hour of 4:44 |
| 3 | p.m., this matter having been continued to 9:00 a.m., March 2, 2019, at San Francisco, California, the |
| 4 | Commission then adjourned.) |
| 5 | * * * * |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

| 1 | BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION |
|----|--|
| 2 | OF THE |
| 3 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING |
| 7 | I, ANA M. GONZALEZ, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER |
| 8 | NO. 11320, IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO |
| 9 | HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE PAGES OF THIS TRANSCRIPT |
| 10 | PREPARED BY ME COMPRISE A FULL, TRUE, AND CORRECT |
| 11 | TRANSCRIPT OF THE TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS HELD IN |
| 12 | THIS MATTER ON FEBRUARY 28, 2020. |
| 13 | I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE |
| 14 | EVENTS OF THE MATTER OR THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDING. |
| 15 | EXECUTED THIS MARCH 06, 2020. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | an laste |
| 21 | ANA M. GONZALEZ CSR NO. 11320 |
| 22 | CSR NO. 11320 |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

| 1 | BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION |
|----|--|
| 2 | OF THE |
| 3 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING |
| 7 | I, CAROL ANN MENDEZ, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER |
| 8 | NO. 4330, IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO |
| 9 | HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE PAGES OF THIS TRANSCRIPT |
| 10 | PREPARED BY ME COMPRISE A FULL, TRUE, AND CORRECT |
| 11 | TRANSCRIPT OF THE TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS HELD IN |
| 12 | THIS MATTER ON FEBRUARY 28, 2020. |
| 13 | I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE |
| 14 | EVENTS OF THE MATTER OR THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDING. |
| 15 | EXECUTED THIS MARCH 06, 2020. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | Jura Am Wan Sa |
| 21 | CAROL ANN MENDEZ CSR NO. 4330 |
| 22 | CDR INO. 1330 |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

| 1 | BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION |
|----|--|
| 2 | OF THE |
| 3 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING |
| 7 | I, REBEKAH L. DE ROSA, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND |
| 8 | REPORTER NO. 8708, IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, |
| 9 | DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE PAGES OF THIS TRANSCRIPT |
| 10 | PREPARED BY ME COMPRISE A FULL, TRUE, AND CORRECT |
| 11 | TRANSCRIPT OF THE TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS HELD IN |
| 12 | THIS MATTER ON FEBRUARY 28, 2020. |
| 13 | I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE |
| 14 | EVENTS OF THE MATTER OR THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDING. |
| 15 | EXECUTED THIS MARCH 06, 2020. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | REBEKAH L. DE ROSA PAR |
| 21 | REBEKAH L. DE ROSA / CSR NO. 8708 |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

| EXAMINATIONS - CHRONOLOGIC | CAL | Cross-Examination by Mr. Miley Examination by Commissioner | v4:6 v4:6 |
|----------------------------------|--------|---|--------------|
| | | BROWNELL, NORA MEAD | |
| OLUME 4 | | Direct Examination by Mr | v4:6 |
| JASON WELLS | | Finkelstein | |
| Direct Examination Resumed By | v4:516 | Cross-Examination by Mr | v4:6 |
| Mr. Weissmann | | Geesman | |
| Cross-Examination by Ms. Kelly | v4:518 | Recross-Examination by Mr | v4:6 |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Geesman | v4:556 | · | |
| Cross-Examination by Ms. Sheriff | v4:580 | HOGLE, JESSICA | |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Abrams | v4:587 | Direct Examination by Ms. Dippo | v4:7 |
| Cross-Examination by Mr | v4:619 | Cross-Examination by Mr. Strauss | v4:7 |
| inkelstein | | Rechtschaffen | |
| Cross-Examination by Mr | v4:647 | Examination by Alj Cooke | v4:6 |
| Alcantar | | Redirect Examination by Mr | v4:6 |
| | 4.000 | Redirect Examination by Mr | v4:7 |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Miley | v4:663 | | |
| Examination by Commissioner | v4:666 | Weissmann | |
| Rechtschaffen | | Recross-Examination by Mr | v4:6 |
| Examination by Alj Cooke | v4:671 | Cross-Examination by Ms. Sheriff | v4:6 |
| Redirect Examination by Mr | v4:674 | Cross-Examination by Ms. Kelly | v4:6 |
| todirect Examination by Wil | V4.074 | Cross-Examination by Mr. Geesman | v4:6 |
| V eissmann | | Cross-Examination by Mr. Long | v4:7 |
| Recross-Examination by Mr | v4:681 | Cross-Examination by Mr. Strauss | v4:7 |
| • | | Cross-Examination by Mr. Abrams | v4:7 |
| Geesman | | Examination by Commissioner | v4:7 |
| Recross-Examination by Mr | v4:682 | Recross-Examination by Mr | v4:7 |
| NORA MEAD BROWNELL | | Weissmann, Mr. | |
| Direct Examination by Mr | v4:684 | Cross-Examination by Ms. Kelly | v4:5 |
| • | | Cross-Examination by Mr. Geesman | v4:5 |
| Veissmann | | Cross-Examination by Ms. Sheriff | v4:5 |
| Cross-Examination by Ms. Sheriff | v4:687 | Cross-Examination by Mr. Abrams | v4:5 |
| Cross-Examination by Ms. Kelly | v4:692 | Cross-Examination by Mr | v4:6 |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Geesman | v4:696 | WELLS IASON | |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Long | v4:704 | WELLS, JASON Direct Examination Regumed By | \./1.E |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Strauss | v4:724 | Direct Examination Resumed By | v4:5 |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Abrams | v4:738 | | |
| Examination by Commissioner | v4:775 | | |
| Rechtschaffen | | | |
| Redirect Examination by Mr | v4:783 | | |
| Veissmann | | | |
| Recross-Examination by Mr | v4:785 | | |
| JESSICA HOGLE | | | |
| Direct Examination by Ms. Dippo | v4:787 | | |
| Cross-Examination by Mr. Strauss | v4:788 | | |
| EXAMINATIONS - ALPHABETIC | ΔΙ | | |

| | 1054 554:20 560:2,8 | 19-09-016 516:11 | 2.6 534:25,26 |
|--|--|--|---|
| # | 563:8 564:11 570:7 652:7,11,24,27 653:13, | 1:00 683:17 | 2.7 517:8 534:4,5,24,26 |
| #08 763:24,27 764:4 | 27 656:12 660:3,10 677:10,12 709:24 | 2 | 2.8 517:8 539:21 543:7 545:5,6,8 |
| \$ | 773:10 | 2 E22.24 E2E.44 E42.20 | 2.9 517:8 |
| \$1 592:13 638:2,5 | 107 596:21 10:22 580:5 | 2 532:21 535:14 542:28 543:2,14 544:28 583:10 651:14 685:24 | 20 564:27 565:10,23 571:16 622:26 624:9 |
| \$10 763:20 | 11 524:22 533:2 534:18 | 2-1 523:2,6 | 677:8 705:22 |
| \$12 575:20 | 575:18 598:2 695:7 | 2-10 535:24 536:2 | 200 670:10 |
| \$150 644:22 | 11.5 538:9 | 537:1 | 2000 739:11 762:13 |
| \$154 644:28 645:8 | 11.825 536:18 | 2-12 651:16 | 2001 705:6 |
| \$16 575:27 576:6 | 11.85 533:7,26 534:19 536:25 537:21 | 2-14 580:17 | 2007 675:23 |
| 667:14 | 11.925 538:11 539:11 | 2-15 562:9 565:22 | 2008 675:23 |
| \$27 584:9 | 541:27 542:17,28 | 572:17 582:3 622:14 625:20 671:9,15 677:17 | 2015 589:18 631:21,24 659:19 |
| \$40 577:19 | 543:17,27 544:1 545:1 | 2-16 531:25 569:27 | 2017 627:15 628:16,23, |
| \$5.8 636:10 | 12 522:26 556:25 557:3 574:21 640:27 788:11 | 582:3 629:6 671:11 | 26 631:7,11,16,19 |
| \$500 552:23,25,28 | 125 572:16 | 2-17 582:3 | 648:18 649:25 650:28 656:7 659:18 662:23 |
| \$6 565:23 569:19 582:15 622:20 | 12:56 683:17 | 2-19 574:21 673:4 | 780:3 |
| \$7 519:2 576:2 582:6,8, | 12th 519:17 | 2-2 531:28 | 2017-2018 680:12 |
| 13 671:23,26 | 13 561:1 574:21 673:7 | 2-21 545:27 | 2017/2018 627:27 |
| \$7.9 636:11 | 13th 719:26 | 2-22 546:7 620:22 630:4 791:15 | 2018 627:16 628:16,24, 26 631:7,11,16,20 |
| 0 | 14 561:1 | 2-22-A 791:15 | 648:19 649:9,10,13,15, |
| 0.1 538:19 542:22 | 15 556:26 557:3 575:18 651:17 | 2-23 585:19 621:3,4,10 | 22,25,28 656:7 780:3 2019 518:15 519:18 |
| | 15,700 596:22 | 2-24 575:18 | 522:6 632:13,23 633:1 |
| 001 518:9 006 518:10 | 15-08-019 580:26 | 2-27 533:24 | 643:6 648:26 649:12, 16,22 650:1 689:11,21 |
| 516.10 | 154 644:24 645:14 | 2-3 542:7,12,14 556:25 672:4 | 690:4 699:9 704:27 |
| 1 | 679:25 | 2-5 561:1 | 723:13 |
| 4 005.40 700.00 707.07 | 16 576:13 620:18 673:7 | 2-dash 651:15 | 2020 516:2 518:10,16 521:20 642:15 664:15 |
| 1 685:18 768:26 787:27 788:10 | 702:11 788:10 | 2-EXH.2.8-1 545:16 | 690:6 691:4 698:22 |
| 1.35 629:11 | 17 589:19 629:15 651:22 763:19 | 2.137 583:17 584:18,28 | 2021 571:6 578:10 |
| 1.5 572:13 | 18 565:22 589:19 | 585:4 | 2022 636:11 |
| 1.6 679:17 | 596:20 622:15 629:15 | 2.2 531:18,21 532:23,24 | 2024 522:6 636:11 |
| 10 563:27 586:4 622:4 | 651:18 659:19 664:27 698:22 | 536:18,19 538:15 | 2025 638:3 |
| 711:15 727:20 | 18th 634:8 | 2.3 532:14 535:13,15 536:3,14 537:11 543:26 | 2050 789:27 |
| 10-K 518:15 698:22,24 | 19 620:11,18 622:25 | 544:2 629:8 671:11,21, | 20th 518:16 |
| 10-minute 580:4 100.0 699:1 | 662:18 702:12 767:19 19-06-015 583:2 676:8 | 27 2.4 531:18 532:17,20,27 | 21 542:12 543:27 587:21 613:11 615:16 616:23 617:3 630:6 |
| | | | |

Index: #08..21

| 671:10,17 698:21 | 33 731:8 | 54 519:11,23 | a.m. 790:22 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 723:10 761:17 | 34 604:27 636:19 | | A1 662:18 |
| 22 723:10 | 35 637:21 | 6 | A4nr 555:27 677:6 |
| 22.18 535:16 536:12 537:27 | 38 604:24,27 | 6 538:17 540:3 541:4 | 695:23 |
| 228 535:1 | 382 570:18 | 542:24 549:24 582:22 634:28 789:16 790:27 | A4nr-x-3 695:28 698:20,23 |
| 23 621:5 664:12 686:3 | | 600 673:15 | A4nr-x-4 695:28 |
| 733:25 734:27 735:4 | 4 | 600-and-700-million | AB 554:20 560:2,8 |
| 23,000 693:22 | 4 534:5 541:26 542:4,7 | 674:5 | 563:8 564:11 570:7 |
| 23-month 596:18 | 543:2,3 544:1 545:1 641:28 685:5 686:14 | 650 538:1,7 | 652:7,11,23,27 653:12 656:12 660:10 677:10 |
| 23.775 532:25 | 696:22 768:27 | 69 520:20 | 709:24 |
| 24 572:17 580:25 | 4-11 727:1 | | ability 547:25 554:17 562:11,16 563:3 585:21 |
| 625:19 672:2 677:19 | 4-12 727:1 | 7 | 586:14 588:26 589:1 |
| 24.15 629:10 247 639:16 | 4-17 770:10 | 7 518:3 545:10 562:9 | 601:7 607:23 608:8 614:8 632:10 634:5 |
| 25 530:18 542:13 | 4-19 694:28 | 663:13,14,23 671:7,17 672:2 685:24 713:7 | 681:23 713:22 739:2 |
| 26 542:13 544:2 548:28 | 4-23 696:18 718:1 | 7-15 664:2 | 758:5 762:28 766:22 768:15 773:5 |
| 549:1 552:5 572:18 | 4-25 696:22 | 70 612:7 727:27 | Abrams 587:11,12,14 |
| 576:18,26 | 4-27 700:11 | 700 575:2 674:1 | 588:23 589:3 590:13,14 |
| 27 549:9 583:8,19 625:19 677:19 | 4-29 702:11 | | 591:26 592:2,21 593:15 594:7,12 595:28 600:2, |
| 27.137 585:1 | 4-31 702:12 | 8 | 19 601:4,21 602:12 |
| 28 516:2 580:25 | 4-32 688:26 723:9 | 8 521:27 522:3 641:5 | 603:1 612:19,20,23 613:8 614:15 617:6,7 |
| 29 521:17 522:26 641:1 | 4-4 692:10 721:27 722:1 767:19 | 686:3 | 618:27,28 619:9 682:7, 10,12 728:9,17 738:3,5 |
| 29th 642:15 643:10 | 4-6 768:24,26 | 80 693:11 727:27 | 739:23 743:1 744:11, |
| 650:2 | 4-8 687:18 711:6 | 789:26 | 14,27 751:23 754:11, 13,15 755:5 757:27 |
| 2:00 684:1 | 4-9 713:7 | 800 579:14 | 760:2,3,7,8 761:8 |
| 3 | 4-EXH.23-1 735:1 | 80s 561:25 | 763:16 766:10,20,23 772:14 774:9,21 777:18 |
| | 42 569:26 | 8:35 516:2 | 778:13 784:19,26,28 |
| 3 541:4 578:23 585:19 627:8 628:19 629:13 | 44.6 698:27 699:14,22, | 9 | 786:4,8,21,27 ABRAMS-X-09 517:19 |
| 655:18 696:22 700:11 | 27 | 9 562:9 575:23,28 586:4 | Abrams-x-9 517:16 |
| 3.7 584:19 | 47 522:6 546:1 | 620:11,24 621:11 | 591:23 |
| 30 526:8 561:11 | 5 | 635:26 788:2,9 | absent 786:13 |
| 302 587:3 | | 9.575 536:21,24 | absolute 767:5 |
| 30th 581:15 643:6 772:3 | 5 517:24 585:19 634:11 641:21 642:3 700:11 | 90 596:24 9:00 790:22 | absolutely 588:14 645:1 688:9 689:19 |
| 31 571:6 696:18 | 5.825 538:16 539:20 | | 691:14 693:7 722:9,21 |
| 31st 571:6 628:11 | 542:23 | Α | 724:9 749:20 750:11 751:14 761:8 784:10 |
| 654:21 | 50 576:18,25 588:3 695:6 | A- 523:22,24 586:26 | absorb 564:15 |
| 32 696:18 | | 648:17 650:9,24,28 | |

Index: 22..absorb

609:8,12 614:11 616:5,

6 623:28 625:14 630:15

638:22 640:4 642:18

653:13 661:15 688:6

719:2 720:5 721:4

649:21 650:19 652:20

722:6,17 725:6 733:10

738:13 739:16 740:9,12

743:8,10 762:25 774:20

accept 657:25 658:26, 27,28 659:1 721:4,9 724:8

accepted 781:11

access 544:9 663:13 688:25

accommodate 726:25

accomplish 778:21

accomplishment 562:3

account 566:16.18 713:11 714:26 715:2 789:11 790:4

accountability 701:9 711:1 734:7 782:5,7

accountable 698:3 701:24 709:16 710:20 719:18 722:5,27 731:20 734:18 735:12 748:11 756:5 767:21 773:28

accounted 600:25

accounting 565:26 572:23 573:6

accounts 573:8,10 639:19,20

accrue 652:28 658:22

accurate 522:8 552:13 592:17 593:7,13 690:13 699:24,28 734:16 756:1

accurately 752:24

achieve 557:4 560:25 672:6,9 700:14 722:24

achieved 587:6 621:23 723:2

achievement 558:14 664:19 722:18,23

achieving 559:24 621:16 635:6 731:23

acknowledge 560:1 564:1 657:18 718:4 755:13 765:19

acknowledged 755:12,14 765:14 acquired 548:23

act 657:28 658:13 714:1

acting 767:6

action 657:14 667:22 720:21 755:21

actions 588:2,16 658:21,22 662:24 744:24 789:17

active 589:9

actively 692:19 693:4 786:15

activist 709:20

activities 690:10 693:13 744:2 790:4

activity 751:8 774:12

activity-based 774:19 784:13,17

actual 522:17 643:9 734:21 737:1 740:25 781:20

acute 649:14 652:21

ad 619:15

adapt 770:27

add 516:18 536:24 779:22 791:4

added 728:26,27,28 729:1.5.23 756:14.16 757:2

addition 553:4 603:27 690:10

additional 517:3 538:12 539:11 554:2 566:10 574:14 577:21 597:16 613:17 639:14 662:19 690:28 730:12

address 521:11 576:21 605:5 628:23 656:17 666:27 667:2,19 723:26 726:15 752:6 789:14

addressed 521:14 566:3 632:16 660:11 694:7 725:16

addresses 535:14 634:6 791:17

752:18 770:16

adequately 725:16

adhere 774:10

adjectives 593:3

adjusted 607:2 789:10

adjustment 640:7

adjustments 546:11 547:4,17 635:12,15 791:13.18

administrative 516:4, 12,14,15 786:24

admirable 775:17

admit 761:9

admonish 753:16

adopt 581:5 686:21

adverse 562:11,15,23 563:1,14 564:16 565:20 649:24 658:20,21

adversely 595:17 660:27

advice 618:24 655:18,

advise 618:7

advisory 756:27

advocate 717:8

advocates 518:9 555:23 663:9 717:12 724:21 789:2

ADVOCATES-X-01 518:11

ADVOCATES-X-02 518:17

agreed 554:23 600:14 613:7 707:17,19 742:27 768:4

agreement 554:27 555:10,12 596:11 597:24 600:13,22 601:12,13,15,17 602:3, 5 603:6,10 606:19 611:15 613:3,25 615:13 632:7 668:2 765:28 772:23 776:28

ahead 584:5 696:5 717:17 742:7 753:2 785:6 786:6

airlines 768:21

akin 658:3

Alcantar 647:19,21,23 659:9,14 661:20 662:28 683:7,8

aligned 743:5,26 744:2,18,24

ALJ 516:9 517:12,21,27 518:6,13,19 520:12,14 522:20,27 523:3 525:26 526:9,15 528:22 531:22 533:21,23 534:6,8,14 538:20,26,28 540:8,17, 21,25 542:2,9,11,15 543:24 544:19,24 545:6,9,11,13 546:13 547:24 548:2 549:4,6 550:2,4,27 555:18 556:27 558:18,27 577:26 580:2,7 581:13, 26 582:1 584:2 585:17 586:2 587:10 588:25 590:12 591:23,27 593:5,14 594:2,8 595:26 599:28 600:17 601:6,10,22,28 602:11, 22 612:18,22 613:7 614:9 617:6 618:28 619:28 621:3 623:28 626:7,17,27 628:13,19, 21 629:2,4,17,21,24 630:1 633:16,18 647:8, 10,14,17 659:6,10 663:2,18,20,26 665:25, 28 671:6 673:3 674:8, 12,14 676:25 678:9 680:24,27 681:1,8,10, 28 682:3,6 683:6,9,11,

13 684:4,12,18 687:1,4 691:21 692:1 695:22 696:1,3 701:14,20 704:6 707:3,6 724:14 730:14,17 734:26 735:4 736:7 737:25,28 739:22 742:27 744:9,13 751:21,24 753:19,26 754:2 758:4 760:1,6 761:5 762:25 763:25 764:2 766:21 773:4 774:7,23 783:4,9,11 784:25 785:1,5,23,26 786:3,18,22,28 787:11, 16,20,22 788:4,6,24 790:9,13,18

Allen 516:14 581:2

Alliance 696:14

allocate 747:8 784:2

allocated 655:9 747:27 748:28

allocates 748:16

allocating 697:5

allocation 747:15,25 784:10

allowed 567:17

allowing 678:10

alluded 659:15

alluding 655:11

alternative 612:15

Amazon 778:8,10

amendment 791:16

amount 542:28 544:15, 17,20 549:19 553:1 554:1 564:15 576:10 585:10 632:2 639:8 643:25 644:3 645:5 651:9 653:1 672:16 680:2 683:1 716:9 725:26 747:5

amounts 538:3 550:10 551:3 554:22 578:15 630:10 643:9 647:1

analysis 564:13,22 565:14 781:12

announcement 649:28 annual 522:1

annually 522:2 578:26

answers 614:3 705:25 725:22 726:11 752:25 754:24

anticipate 521:5 523:21 568:12 572:24 574:18 577:4 578:1,11 604:12,13

anticipated 605:6 655:26 671:8,18,24

anticipates 576:19 637:16

anticipating 532:9

anticipation 571:1

apologies 529:11 534:21 538:17 541:7 542:14 565:16 577:16 584:21 628:17 649:11 784:18 785:5

apologize 542:5 596:5 598:23 601:9 644:20 671:13 739:24 751:23

app- 569:13 631:2

apparent 767:13

apparently 587:20 708:8

appears 637:2

apples 763:9 776:21

application 521:13 556:10 566:20 568:28 569:4,8,14,24 570:27 573:3,18 574:19 576:23 577:26 578:2,7,12 626:2,3 630:28 656:2 660:24 661:8 662:6 668:23 669:14 672:15

applications 540:10, 12.18 556:21

apply 560:7 694:10 697:23

apportion 583:15

apprise 590:3

approach 526:15 680:17

appropriately 673:24 697:17 764:17

approval 551:25 791:26

Index: agreed..assessments

approve 627:25

approved 569:11 670:1,5,9,12,20 675:28

approves 569:24 627:14

approving 675:15

approximately 538:1 636:11

April 704:27

arbitrarily 733:13

areas 589:2 637:26 655:3,19 708:11 725:15 726:15 734:8 748:1

argue 743:15

argued 743:16

arguments 659:28

Ariel 724:19 788:28

arise 716:15

arising 678:19

arose 759:6

arrangement 765:17

arrival 757:7

artful 748:24

article 593:6

articulate 655:23 701:3

artifical 702:5

ascertain 755:4

aspects 670:23 677:3 708:12 778:3

assertion 609:7,8

assess 602:17 657:28

assessment 527:12 528:7,27 557:26,28 559:4 562:25 563:11 571:5 596:15 676:3

assessments 656:11

asset 552:7 598:14,17, 27 599:4.6.9.12 610:27 611:1 747:11 749:1 768:19 781:6 **assets** 548:23 678:13, 15 699:19 747:12 749:4 **assign** 749:18 assigned 516:15 782:7 786:24 assigning 782:5 Assistant 516:11 Association 580:16 687:15 **assume** 563:13 572:12 634:20 660:24 720:12 737:11 **assumed** 571:24 **assumes** 670:12 assumption 578:6 608:10 660:22 assumptions 571:27 604:5 660:21 assurances 653:24 assure 572:25 655:6

661:3 764:12 **AT&T** 729:3 at-risk 691:16 attached 642:6 attachment 640:21 attachments 769:13 attempt 751:16 attempting 539:26 attention 706:14 727:1 786:23

attorney 526:10,11 618:13 643:1 741:4 attorneys 587:25,26 592:15 603:7 612:6

attornies 617:25 attract 741:25 773:20, 21.25

attracting 742:17 745:3 758:13

attributable 578:19 attribute 583:15.16 attributes 693:28

audit 730:5 734:8 781:22.27 782:1.6

audits 781:19,21 782:3

author 593:4

authority 540:11,13 544:20 737:16 764:13 779:25 785:11

authorization 539:16 540:2 541:8,10 543:13 544:27 556:11 576:20 577:6.22 578:4 672:17

authorizations 531:14 577:2,17 672:21

authorize 539:27 authorized 566:5,6 607:5,7 638:24,28

authorizes 543:4 availability 568:16

570:19 589:23

639:5

average 519:1 522:2 523:17,28 524:5 561:11,13 571:15 572:14 574:15 578:28 638:2,5 668:17,20,21 669:8

avoid 713:20 732:7 avoids 639:3 avowed 717:7

await 786:25

awarded 664:18 763:19

awards 664:15.23 764:5

aware 529:25 530:22 540:9,16,17,20,21 588:3,7,11 589:7,8 602:3 603:13,15 635:19 650:13,18 688:28 689:5,9,14,17,22,26 702:28 703:7,10 719:1, 8 720:12 749:5,8,15,19, 20 752:5 762:12,14,15

763:17,21 764:24 765:1,7 766:6 784:15 790:3,5

awry 657:6,7,15,17 659:3

В

B-U-T-T-E 631:22

back 520:14 523:1 526:18 533:23 534:8.22 537:11 538:28 541:1 545:13 547:28 549:6 550:4 552:3 562:23 565:6 567:16 580:5,7 596:9 597:1 629:4,28 633:18 640:11,26 647:10,17 663:20,26 665:28 675:19 679:24 681:1,10 684:4 687:4 696:3 699:16 701:8 707:6 708:4 728:4 737:28 775:5 781:18 783:11 786:23 787:22 788:6 790:18

background 587:16 769:16,27

backstop 551:16 575:21 667:28 668:2

baked 772:23

balance 681:25 700:8 713:17

balancing 639:20

ballpark 674:2

band 574:25 670:16,18, 27,28 671:1

bank 646:8 694:13 727:21

banking 758:15,18 779:18

bankruptcies 625:17 772:5

bankruptcy 517:18 530:3,9,14,16 531:2 532:8,12 533:17 536:11 537:7 542:1 544:10 567:12 570:6 582:9 583:5,26 584:11 587:17,19 591:24

593:17,21,23 594:14 596:11 598:15 599:24 601:2 602:26 603:24 604:10 605:5 610:8 611:6,8,24 614:13 625:28 626:20 632:14 633:28 643:18 646:21 648:26 649:5 650:2 651:25 653:1 654:23 659:20 667:2 725:5 738:12 739:10 754:8,18 759:6,18 762:13,16 763:7,10,11,12,18 764:1,25 765:24 767:8 771:27 772:5 778:2,4

Index: asset..basis

bankruptcy-proof 625:17,27 626:11

bankruptcy-related 679:13

banks 548:13 592:14 672:14

barely 647:22

base 521:23 522:3,5, 12,13,15 564:28 565:10 566:5,9,22 567:19 577:20,24 578:18,23 589:25 623:6 645:22 646:4,26,28 677:9 722:13

based 528:11,18 558:11 563:6 571:4 573:19 578:14 601:16 603:25 616:22 631:2 646:10 650:6 658:24 702:6 706:4 709:28 764:14 776:9,10 779:25 785:11

baseline 656:11.20

bases 658:25

basic 660:9

basically 519:5 535:1 637:20 741:6

basis 530:16 543:22 544:11 549:14 558:7 560:24 561:15 572:16 575:2 622:11 635:8.11 637:17,19 639:7,28 640:2,6 656:19 658:16 661:1 662:10 668:27 669:8,18 670:10 676:14 693:27

| 033.21 | 001.13,23 002.23 | 032.14 030. |
|--|---|---|
| Batjer 666:11 669:24 | 603:21 604:1,3 615:7 | 697:22 698: 704:26 705: |
| Battalion 757:1 | 669:5,19 760:21,22 769:17 | 704.26 705. |
| BB 527:15,20 | benefits 570:8,11 | 713:28 714: |
| BBB 524:27 525:7,22 526:20,24 586:25 648:18,21,23,27 649:6 650:7,23 | 572:19 573:14,28 587:5 603:8 625:21,26 677:24,27,28 678:3 776:13 | 12,14 720:9 28 722:4,6,2 17 725:27 7 728:1,7,18 7 732:19 733: |
| BBB+ 523:22,24 524:9 | Beth 609:22 | 20 738:27 7 |
| 586:26 | bias 715:2 | 751:2,11 75 24 756:14,2 |
| BBB- 524:27 525:7,22 526:20,24 | big 727:16 743:6 746:10 768:22 | 757:4,10 75 764:13,20 7 |
| bear 653:1 668:18 | biggest 745:16 779:10 | 766:16,25,2 11,17,24,26 |
| bearing 553:22 566:8 | bill 561:9,18 639:16 | 769:3,12,25 |
| bearings 621:9 | 729:2 783:22 785:17 | 11,15 774:1 777:17,23,2 |
| bears 657:26 | billion 519:2 532:25 | 782:18 |
| beat 745:26 746:6 | 533:7,26 534:19 535:16 536:12,18,21,24 | board's 726 |
| began 546:7 | 537:21,27 538:9,12,16, | boards 697 |
| begin 734:10 787:1 | 17 539:11,20 540:3 541:5,27 542:18,23,24, | 700:12 712: |
| beginning 530:17 | 28 543:17,28 544:2 | Bob 619:6 |
| 534:17 620:25 622:4 | 545:1 549:25 565:23 569:19 575:20,23,27,28 | boil 607:16 |
| 650:1 651:17 664:12 713:7 731:7 734:11 735:10 | 576:2,6 577:19 578:23, 25 582:6,8,13,15,22 583:8,10,17,19 584:9, | bond 537:5 604:14 650: 23,28 |
| begins 621:11 | 18,28 585:2,4 592:14 | bondholdei |
| begun 695:15 730:20 | 598:2 604:24,27,28 622:20 629:10,11 | 600:5 |
| behalf 787:3 789:2 | 636:10,11 638:2,5 667:14 671:7,17,23,26 | bondholdei 611:11 |
| behaved 764:17 | 672:2,3 673:10,16,19 | bondholde |
| behavior 710:17 | 679:17 | perhaps 59 |
| 743:23 767:10 | billions 592:11 604:25 | bonds 536: |
| behaviors 732:1 756:11 | 605:14 715:28 | 571:9,10 57 |
| beholder 697:2 | bills 561:10 608:6 638:13,16 639:2 715:8 | 579:5,19,23 621:25,28 6 |
| behooves 746:28 | bit 533:19 595:14 | 669:3,6 |
| belief 686:25 712:8 | 606:10 616:4 631:23, 25,27 644:23 673:19 | borrower 5 549:11 552: |
| believer 746:11 | 676:22 704:15 736:11 761:7 766:26 | borrowing |
| believes 772:6 | black 769:28 | 553:17,19 6 |
| below-1990 789:26 | blame 559:19 | borrowings |
| benchmark 561:5 | blank 672:27 | bottom 533 620:12 636: |
| benefit 519:14 554:13, 17 575:6,11 579:14,18 | board 684:24 687:22, 24 688:3,8,12,20,23 | 620:12 636: |
| | | |

601:19,25 602:25

692:14 693:2 694:22 **bounce** 640:26 3:6 703:4,18 **bound** 574:25 610:12 5:4 709:18,20 2:2,27,28 **bow** 781:12 :25 717:7, **break** 536:4 550:27 9 721:2,23, 580:4 25 723:16, 727:26 breakdown 530:20 729:8 629:15 3:22 736:19, **breaks** 534:1 749:25 52:4,5 755:9, **bridge** 539:21 540:27 20,25,26 543:6 544:12 545:4 58:13 548:18,19,20 550:18, 765:8 20,21 791:21,24,25 28 767:5,10, **briefly** 632:13 633:25 6 768:5 639:11 651:13 676:27 5,28 770:1. 687:2 16 775:11 24 779:24,27 **bring** 682:15 697:11,19 757:16 770:7 779:22 786:23 789:5 6:27 750:7 **brings** 775:22 779:19 7:14 698:4 2:6 715:26 **broad** 649:17 broader 560:11 652:6 **broadly** 519:25 520:28 589:17 776:10 571:2 :9,12,14,22, broken 529:20 629:8 **Brownell** 684:7,8,16,22 r 599:18,25 687:11 691:11 696:8 701:14 704:12 724:19 728:22 734:27 751:25 rs 599:20 753:20 775:3 785:28 **Bruno** 720:13,20 rs-92:13 **budgets** 698:1,2,3 701:25 :21 538:19 77:10,13 **build** 610:2,6,11,19 3,25 604:20 732:20 775:13,14 650:20,21 **bullet** 523:9 634:12,15 635:1,2 692:14,16 548:23 693:6 695:4 721:27 8:2 722:3 541:11 bulwark 606:7 611:7 burden 560:19 **s** 537:10 bureau 776:9,25 3:24 604:23 bureaucracy 702:2 :5 641:28):10 **burn** 754:27

Index: Batjer..burn

burned 615:27 616:3 765:12 **business** 521:19 527:11 528:7,28 557:28 559:5,8,12 607:1,6 636:16 662:27 675:13, 16 684:14,16 692:28 693:12,21 697:15 702:3,9 708:16 709:3 724:20 726:8 727:8,16, 19,22,24 748:1 768:9 769:19 770:27 771:2,4 773:16 774:1 776:8 778:17 787:13,15 789:1,3 businesses 724:22 725:15 728:2 771:1 776:25 busy 725:28

Butte 631:22.24 632:1

buy 615:4

by-in-large 598:10

C

C-HOOKS 741:11

CAISO 699:23

Cal 518:7,11,14,17 555:23 757:1

calamitous 689:1

calculate 564:27

calculation 547:5 576:11 635:16 673:17 674:5,28

calculations 590:28 591:2

California 516:1 527:12 528:8,27 559:17,23 560:4,11,13, 18 580:15 586:20,24 593:18,24 606:13 609:3 675:21 684:17 687:14, 17 695:6 702:6 763:4 772:8 789:20

California's 705:8

Californians 769:7

call 533:28 538:12 542:27 548:7,8,17 587:17 610:4 684:6 709:2,20 720:21 738:12 745:28 758:10 767:7 787:2

called 519:25 520:9 684:8 787:7

Calls 547:22

Calpers 773:22

Calsters 773:23

Camp 649:15

candidly 715:25

capacity 562:21 648:11

capita 561:24,27

capital 544:10 546:22 547:2,6 553:15 562:12, 17 563:4 566:4,20 572:24 573:4 575:23,25 581:21,25 617:4 641:15 661:11 662:21 667:13 672:24 673:27 674:6 697:5 720:26 741:26 747:8,15,25,27 748:16, 28 760:26 784:2,5 791:13.18

capitalizational 666:25

capitalized 667:12 668:7

capture 706:13 723:18

careful 654:15

carefully 652:13 697:10 700:7 701:26 747:13 782:1

carriers 590:16

carry 560:19

case 524:24 544:17 549:19 575:6 602:26 603:22 634:10 641:5 661:14 666:27 667:19 716:7 745:5 767:12

cases 637:14 639:3,14 658:17,25 662:8 712:18 742:16

cash 530:24 552:6 566:13 568:6 570:14 582:20 588:5 597:23 598:2 612:14 613:17 616:12 617:22,27 635:27 636:2,6 640:18

casual 747:6

catastrophic 563:8 564:11 595:10,15 613:20 677:15 764:15 779:26

categorically 597:5

categories 644:5,15 645:13,26

category 644:6,7,9 645:16 647:5

caused 649:23 659:21 720:27 753:13

CCA 520:9,25

CCP 730:5

ceded 555:22.23

center 672:14

central 609:3 754:28

cents 744:23

CEO 654:13 665:7 722:5 767:20 768:3 780:24 783:23,26 785:17

CEO's 664:28

certainty 554:20 767:5

CFO 528:11 697:27

chair 705:4 723:17 728:22 749:25 765:8 766:15,25

chairman 684:24 763:18

challenge 604:5 670:21 746:15 773:18

challenged 770:24

challenges 544:17 588:28 677:2 776:14

challenging 659:2

change 544:22 631:14 646:11 654:28 659:16,

21 660:9 670:15 679:28 727:26 729:20 733:12 743:12,18,23 760:19 768:5,7 770:20,21 771:18 775:24 777:6,9 778:22 781:26

Index: burned..chosen

changed 680:2 710:27 729:15 733:5 755:20 770:25 771:8 776:7 778:23

changing 732:1 775:19

chapter 524:22 663:13, 14,23 685:5 686:14 695:7 788:2,9,13,17 789:16 790:27

characterization 593:9,12,26 594:11,27 598:13 603:16 608:28 614:6 616:6 625:15 644:10 654:1

characterize 520:15 522:15 535:9 554:25 603:17 654:27

characterizing 647:2

charge 626:22

charges 668:19 754:3

chart 521:21,22

chase 653:17

check 522:4,7 529:27 530:2 538:20 612:18 648:15 720:28 774:7

checking 768:25

chemical 694:11

Chief 516:12 549:26 556:9 600:3 737:7.10 757:2 775:21 777:12 780:10,27 781:4,16 783:19

choice 520:8.16 748:22 750:14

choices 750:20 752:17

choose 741:9 748:7,9 750:19 762:6

chose 749:12

chosen 593:4 703:21 724:6

Chris 756:28 chronological 648:14 chronology 650:27 **chunk** 583:18 **churn** 700:1 circumstance 574:16 circumstances 563:6 610:2 716:27 718:21 723:7 746:27 763:7 City 555:21 **claim** 519:2 675:22 683:1 claimants 603:23 claims 537:5,6 570:5 597:28 598:6 599:16, 18,19,20 622:22 623:3, 7 627:9,16,27 628:24 629:9,12 630:9,19 631:1,9,12,15 632:3,13, 18.19.24.27 633:7 638:18 649:24 650:3 671:10,20,25 678:19,21 clarification 526:11 546:15 550:28 585:11 628:2 629:13 630:17 631:19 680:21 clarifications 516:18 627:5 631:4 clarified 546:6,8 557:10 663:23

clarify 524:20 531:11 539:8 544:26 545:15 546:19 550:19,25 557:17,18 584:21 628:7 645:12 646:1 654:3.19 655:15 656:9 660:14 674:21 677:19 725:12 783:21

clarifying 543:24

clarity 653:5 655:1,13 659:26 785:19

class 602:15 616:20,21 617:3 760:13 761:18 764:25

clauses 618:16

clean 561:3

cleanup 520:4

clear 557:7 577:8 586:5,6 622:4 659:28 710:22 711:14 730:28 745:8 747:3 751:13 755:6 768:6 773:8

CLECA 580:8,16 687:7, 15 791:2

clients 612:8 618:5,7

climate 561:20 740:5 743:18 789:20,21

close 531:1 546:21 687:23.26.27 700:16

closely 705:9 730:6 732:5

closer 643:17 674:1 775:17

closing 612:15

closure 782:4

Co-funded 537:5.6

Coalition 647:24

coffee 761:6

collaboration 733:14

colleague 787:18

collected 625:10

collection 632:9 673:28

collectively 732:11

column 636:26 641:9

combination 568:19

combined 534:27

comfort 554:22

comfortable 564:16 757:11 767:4.9

commendable 746:26

comment 593:3 703:11 758:6 765:21

comments 673:16 783:28

commercial 724:22 789:4

commission 530:20 531:13 539:27 540:10 546:5 556:12,21 560:7 569:12,24 580:26 581:5,10 582:12 591:13,18 593:19,24 606:13 607:7 608:25 627:13,25 629:20 631:5 643:24 646:8 653:11,25 655:6,16 656:10,22 657:9,27 658:7 660:7 661:2 675:14 682:24 702:28 703:26 720:14 721:8 731:17 733:15 734:2 735:15,23 748:12

Commission's 547:8 721:9 773:10 784:1.4

753:22 758:16 761:25

771:15 784:8

commissioner 584:7 666:2.6 671:3 674:18 692:2 762:16 763:1 774:24,26 775:2,9 783:2 786:25

commit 720:9

commitment 539:19, 21.23 540:28 541:2.23 543:6 548:1,14,19,20, 27 550:17,18,20,22 552:4 576:5 600:26 695:10 706:10 719:23 726:8 735:21 745:16 748:23 767:10 769:6 777:4,10 791:22

commitments 549:12 551:23 575:21 653:23 658:9 695:12 731:10, 19,22,23 733:4,27 734:21.22.24 736:5

committed 544:11 553:15 554:11,21 555:15 655:24 694:23 732:13 733:7,8 734:19 769:7 789:22

committee 688:3 697:14,27 698:4 701:23 702:19,22,26 703:4,17 723:28 726:3 729:22,27 731:3 756:20,27 764:12 780:12 781:15,23,27 782:1 784:21

committees 702:14 730:7 732:4 736:21 755:9

Index: Chris..company

committing 599:17 644:26 645:6

common 555:11 575:23,28 616:28 635:3 709:2 712:19 752:15

commonly 781:11

commonly-held 714:5

communication 689:24

communications 589:9 707:26

communities 597:19 714:15 746:18

community 520:8,16 608:16 610:10 616:1 675:25 714:19 720:22 726:9 727:24

compact 559:18,23 564:8 716:28 746:19

companies 590:11 591:3,5,17 597:25 741:27 745:2,7,24 746:22 750:24 768:23 781:12

company 521:23 525:1,9 527:6,17,22 528:12 530:6,21 535:22 537:8.10.28 546:23 547:1,9 550:20 551:10, 11,24 552:17,24 553:17,20 554:18 555:7 556:10 557:4 558:8 559:14 560:24 562:21 565:1 567:5 573:11 581:2 583:25,26 586:21 591:4 594:16 604:9 606:2 610:3,7,8 612:11, 13 613:16 615:16,27 616:3 621:25 628:10 637:12 643:1 647:28 656:6 673:23 678:25 679:2,8,14,26 680:3,9, 16 684:9 687:17.28 693:12 694:12,21 700:25 701:11 702:6,20 703:12,25 705:18 709:19 711:17,21

645:22 662:24,25 674:19,24 675:16 692:28 693:21 698:21 705:20

company-wide 777:4 **compare** 561:12

Compared 598:28 599:1

comparison 650:23

compensate 682:20

compensated 553:12 764:26 765:10

compensation 642:20 664:6,28 665:12,13 682:27 706:12 710:27 721:17 722:8,10,11,16, 19 723:3,6,28 724:2 764:8,12,21 772:27 773:7 774:18 779:25 780:2 784:14,20

competencies 725:10, 13

competing 611:11

competition 745:27

competitive 745:25 746:1,9,14 747:17 778:17

complaints 689:23

complete 546:3 651:20 734:13 735:10

completed 782:28 791:2

completely 563:5 703:14

complex 689:2 691:7

compliance 547:5,13 692:23 693:18 730:15, 26 731:1,2,15 732:15 735:24,28 737:8,10,17

615:12 662:21 741:19

component 579:23 625:11,16 626:15 656:3

components 749:4

compound 658:14

compounded 522:1

comprehensive 771:24

comprised 702:23

comprises 685:23

compromise 712:1,26

compromised 713:2 741:14

conceivably 661:16 concept 574:7 763:13

concepts 662:3

conceptually 573:22

concern 559:17 667:21 691:8 705:20 745:11

concerned 658:8

concerns 562:8 662:26 666:25,28 667:16 675:20 678:9 710:2 770:20

conclude 631:6 643:9 764:17

concludes 674:8 conclusion 547:23

conclusively 740:19 condemnation

552:10,13

condition 547:9,11,15, 21

conditions 539:28 540:13,19 546:23 549:24 556:13 560:9 565:12 580:19,21,22 583:3 595:11 740:5,25

conducted 710:3

conductors 741:12

confidence 529:2 560:11 566:19 573:2 585:20,22 657:23

confident 657:21 734:15

confidential 530:1,5,8 545:18,19 570:23 610:26 614:23 617:10,

confidentiality 609:24,26 610:1

confined 681:21

confirm 570:19

confirmation 532:6 580:20,23

confirmed 621:20 632:21

conflict 608:3 715:19, 24 716:4,24,26 717:10, 19 718:20 719:4,11 720:12 724:26 761:21

conflicting 718:16

conflicts 713:20 766:3

confronting 700:25

confused 736:5

confusing 776:21

connect 556:18

connection 546:5,27

consequence 563:15

consequences 610:25

considerable 690:14

consideration 522:14 695:17 719:22 762:2 767:17

considerations 634:16 713:18 715:1

Index: company's..continued

considered 527:17 554:25 564:25 662:7 682:19 695:12 713:3 777:23

consist 664:16

consistency 717:2

consistent 527:8 700:3

consistently 533:16

consolidated 634:20 635:22.27

consolidation 701:10

constituencies 725:21 726:19

constituency 727:27

constraints 615:6 623:27

consultants 592:14

consultation 706:17

Consumers 580:16 687:15

consumption 561:25, 26

contained 532:21

contemplate 575:22

contemplated 533:27 573:16 584:10 626:22, 23

contemplates 645:19

contemplating 532:1, 3 574:6 625:8,13

context 530:3,9 631:27 634:25 635:10 637:8 664:4 762:23

continue 567:20 574:14 617:26 618:1 666:26 667:18 705:23, 27 726:20,25 732:5 741:26 751:24 762:6 770:9 789:24

continued 561:28 662:5

Index: continues..create

continues 620:16 748:13

continuing 614:24 616:25

continuum 565:5

contract 701:4,5

contractors 701:7

contracts 771:10

contribute 605:7,11,12

contributing 741:16

contribution 554:18 570:7 576:1,16 652:2,6, 7 665:6 667:15 729:11 778:1

contributions 574:14 575:27 651:22,25

contributor 589:5

control 538:19 542:22 577:10,13 579:5,23

controls 747:25

controversy 703:7

conversation 723:4 759:12 765:6 766:12,14

converse 599:7

convey 558:5

Cooke 516:4,9,13 517:12,21,27 518:6,13, 19 520:12,14 522:20,27 523:3 525:26 526:9,15 528:22 531:22 533:21, 23 534:6,8,14 538:20, 26,28 540:8,17,21,25 542:2,9,11,15 543:24 544:19,24 545:6,9,11, 13 546:13 547:24 548:2 549:4,6 550:2,4,27 555:18 556:27 558:18, 27 577:26 580:2,7 581:13,26 582:1 584:2 585:17 586:2 587:10 588:25 590:12 591:23, 27 593:5,14 594:2,8 595:26 599:28 600:17 601:6,10,22,28 602:11, 22 612:18,22 613:7 614:9 617:6 618:28 619:28 621:3 623:28

626:7,17,27 628:13,19, 21 629:2,4,17,21,24 630:1 633:16,18 647:8, 10,14,17 659:6,10 663:2,18,20,26 665:25, 28 671:6 673:3 674:8, 12,14 676:25 678:9 680:24,27 681:1,8,10, 28 682:3,6 683:6,9,11, 13 684:4,12,18 687:1,4 691:21 692:1 695:22 696:1,3 701:14,20 704:6 707:3,6 724:14 730:14,17 734:26 735:4 736:7 737:25,28 739:22 742:27 744:9,13 751:21,24 753:19,26 754:2 758:4 760:1,6 761:5 762:25 763:25 764:2 766:21 773:4 774:7,23 783:4,9,11 784:25 785:1,5,23,26 786:3,18,22,28 787:11, 16,20,22 788:4,6,24 790:9,13,18

copies 619:24

copy 591:27

core 721:14 725:9,12

corner 620:12 642:1

Corona 554:16

corporate 537:9 550:15 581:23 609:24 692:20 693:5,17,28 703:15,22,27 769:14

corporation 523:11,15 524:22 530:5,21 537:23 538:4 548:9 549:19 550:12,21 551:4,12 552:26 553:27 617:1 647:28 648:2,6,9 684:25,26 687:25 693:3 702:24 744:25 754:19, 26 780:24 785:17 787:15 791:22,25

corporation's 529:21

corporations 759:5

correct 519:3,4,7,8,26, 27 520:1,6,7,10,26 525:12,20 527:2,18,19, 26,27 529:13,14,22,23 531:15,16,19,20

532:13,15,16 533:8,11 534:4,28 535:6,19,20 539:24 540:7 543:18 544:23 545:2 546:24,25 548:9,12,24,25 549:23, 27,28 550:13 551:26 552:19,20 553:2,6,7,10 557:14,16 563:13 569:20,21,25 570:22,28 571:11 573:12 574:20 575:9 576:14 577:14 579:15,16,20 583:11,23 592:7,8 593:2 597:5,25, 26 600:27 604:19,26,28 605:13,16 606:21,22 607:17,19,25,27 609:17,26 612:27 613:4 617:16,23 619:11 621:24 622:2,12,23,24 623:1 624:8,23,24 627:18,22,28 631:8,9, 17 632:19 634:9,27 635:14 636:7 637:4,26, 28 638:15,21 639:10 642:8,9 643:3,13,15 644:11,17 646:17 647:4 648:16,20,22 649:20 650:3,4 651:1,2,4,6,7 653:2 654:26 657:3,4,9 679:28 680:1 681:26 683:3.4 684:27 685:25 686:5,24 687:21 695:8 699:8 708:5 714:3,4,11 718:17 722:12,15 724:28 725:1 727:9.10 736:2 744:16 780:14,15 788:19

corrected 732:21

correction 659:16 785:22

corrections 656:13 788:17

correctly 565:11 567:28 575:15 636:10

correlation 650:16

cost 522:17 561:9 566:4,7,8,20 567:18 572:23 573:3 574:11 607:1,3 623:20 637:25 639:7,17,21,26,28 640:6,20 641:25 655:25 656:7 669:3 672:24 673:9,14,27 674:6 678:26 679:4 734:9

cost-efficient 697:8

cost-reduction 698:5

cost-related 698:7

costs 519:2 570:10 607:6 624:28 625:4,9 627:9,16,27 628:24 630:19 631:1,8,9,12,15, 21 632:3,14 633:7 634:21 637:16,18 638:3,7,18 639:4,9,14 644:14 645:11,14,17, 18,21,27 646:3,14,20, 22,25,27 650:20 654:22,24 655:9,27 659:17.24 660:12.15.18 668:18 669:7,20 672:19 673:8 675:23,26 680:12 697:11,20,28 716:2,19, 20,21

Council 780:8,14 782:14

counsel 539:9 546:14 550:25,28 654:15 672:28 677:6 678:8 679:7 690:24 703:19 737:3,9,12,13,15,21,23 754:16 768:25 785:14, 15,20 789:1 791:7

counting 606:15

country 561:27 741:24

county 555:21 746:13

couple 584:16 651:18 695:27 721:16 732:23 739:14 770:13 778:24

court 530:16 597:9 601:3 610:9 633:28 765:24

cover 518:15

covered 564:11 628:15 660:20 741:12

covering 516:13

CPP 730:9,14 736:24

CPUC 688:18

cracks 732:8

create 713:2 746:3 752:19 781:10

created 606:6 649:9 675:24

creates 602:27 603:23, 25 676:18,28

creating 743:12

credit 520:5 523:18
524:11,26 525:6,21
526:19,23,28 527:4,14,
21,25,26 528:1,4,15,19
529:7 557:6,8,12,27
559:28 560:2,3,5
561:19 562:2,24 574:4
579:26 586:7,9,19
604:9 622:5,9 648:15,
17 649:8,22 650:12,16
662:18,22,25 670:2,14,
16,17,19,22 672:10
674:20,24 675:9,10
676:4,13 677:3 681:20

credits 572:20 573:27 574:2 625:22 626:26 662:9.10 668:15

crisis 705:6

critical 706:25 746:18

critically 610:21 769:16

cross 577:3 609:22 682:16 787:2

cross-collateralized 566:24 567:3

cross-default 566:25 567:4

cross-examination

517:11,13,17,23 518:1, 20,22 545:23 556:2 580:11 587:13 614:2 619:4,21 647:20 663:4 680:22 686:28 687:7,9 692:6 695:26 696:6 698:20 704:10 724:17 738:3,4 788:23,26

cross-examiner 555:26 680:25 704:7

cross-functional 732:3

Crosstalk 735:5 751:20

cultivate 692:20 693:4

culture 581:4 692:20 693:5,17,24,28 754:19, 21 755:21

cumbersome 702:1

cumulative 522:16

curious 724:5

current 619:14 641:24 642:21 643:25 645:2,4, 14 679:16 709:15 741:16 770:8 775:26

customer 519:16,25 520:1,5,27 521:3 522:10,11 561:16 567:17 603:28 605:26 606:8 608:2 626:4,25 638:12 639:1 656:21 661:7 662:9,10 673:25 715:1,20 717:8,9,12 726:18 727:6,8,11,14 729:1,4 743:26 745:9 746:5 761:11,14 775:17 778:14 779:19

customer's 660:10 700:6

customer-facing 727:15

customer-related 520:17 522:14

customers 522:18 554:16 561:8 562:1,5 566:2,8,19 567:15 574:15 575:7,12 590:26 604:2 607:4 608:25 622:28 630:10 631:1 658:23 661:12 668:17. 27,28 669:4,6,8,17,18 672:26 680:4 687:16 689:10,18 690:27 691:6,13,15,16 696:21 700:16 713:12 714:11, 15,23,26 715:4,5 716:6 717:17 724:23 726:22 727:18 733:1 738:10,13 743:5,28 744:18 745:12 760:18,23 761:27 772:8 778:12,15,16 789:4

customers' 536:22 581:8

cut 567:8 638:6 653:17, 18 717:25

D

D.19-06-008 703:2

dais 584:4 692:3

damage 649:24 650:3

danger 689:27

dare 683:8

dash 542:13 651:14

data 518:2,9 529:28 620:5,9,13,17 641:20, 23 680:8,9,19 701:10 702:5,7 706:16 708:24 719:28 745:9 747:12 756:2 768:12,13,16

database 732:20

date 532:1,2,5,17 618:21 631:4 639:21 664:25 680:15,16,18 772:3

date-certain 791:2

dated 518:10,16 519:17

dates 665:9

day 529:11 615:16 732:14 752:11 791:9

days 666:12

DCC 587:25

de-consolidate

681:24 **deal** 599:25 602:18

604:28 605:2,3 658:19 **dealing** 692:26 693:20

Dear 655:16

debt 523:18 524:1,6
527:16 528:2,16 529:8
532:25 533:7,13,15,26
534:20,23 535:4,5,13,
16,22 536:4,12,13,14,
20,26 537:4,5,6,12,19,
22,23,28 538:4,9,13,15,
16 539:12,15 540:3,4,
11,14 541:5,27 542:21,
23,24 543:9,11 544:3,
13,27 550:12,15 551:7,
14 552:11,19 555:9,12
557:5,13,24 558:25

559:26 560:14,23 565:24,28 566:6,10,23, 26 567:5,13,18,19,24 568:8,9,14,24,27 569:13,16,27 570:17 574:11 576:9 577:2,16, 21 578:25 582:4,14,16, 23 583:20 585:22 586:15 598:20,25 599:11 604:24,26 605:1,3,4,5,8,10 611:20 622:21,26 623:5,11,14, 16,20 624:5,18,22,25 625:1,5 630:12 648:5,9, 11 651:1,3,8 655:25 660:19,23 661:16,18 662:17 669:2,7 670:4, 26 672:7,17,21,25 673:9,21 678:25,26 679:2,4 680:5

Index: created..decline

debt-carrying 654:24 debt-related 672:18 debtholders' 624:5 debtor 678:14 debtors 519:16 debts 540:1 674:26

decade 607:10 706:5 707:10

December 719:26 **decided** 658:18,25

deciding 568:23 748:15 784:1

decides 607:7

decimated 765:12

decision 564:5 569:18, 23 581:3,14 585:14 586:28 593:25 608:4 612:11 618:6 675:14,28 676:6,8,10,17,24 688:15 703:1 748:20

decision-making 712:1 713:3

decisions 717:14

declare 547:3 declared 626:19

decline 649:18

| - 0.0 - 0.0 | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| declined 596:27 648:17 | depend 586:15 dependent 532:5 | determination 680:11, 17 716:10 735:22,23 | direct 516:22 522:21 531:22 542:2 579:26 |
| declines 715:11 | 578:27 716:27 | determine 525:28 | 620:21 624:15 625:20 630:4 635:13 648:4 |
| decrease 656:20 | depending 527:23 | 562:14 652:6 710:12 740:25 747:9 751:16 | 684:20 715:9 723:9 |
| decreased 728:2 | 563:21 565:7 | 752:19 | 787:24 |
| dedicated 625:10,15 | depends 716:9 776:2 | determined 721:8 | directed 784:9 |
| 626:14 | deploying 752:20 | determining 697:23 | direction 686:19 784:20 788:14 |
| deemed 677:15 | deployment 752:22 | detriment 720:17 | directional 596:28 |
| deep 693:11 709:21 | deposit 520:2 | 721:6 743:28 749:16 | |
| default 624:4 | depreciation 522:19 | detrimental 603:9 | directionally 522:8 674:1 |
| defer 543:23 | Deputy 737:2,8,15 | develop 667:13 706:15 | directly 538:8 541:9 582:22 588:23 592:21 623:5 632:11 657:14 660:12 661:23 757:27 |
| deferred 629:11 | 785:14 | 734:21 | |
| 739:16,25,26 740:3,10 742:3,12 | describe 559:7,12 565:23 576:16 579:3 | developed 741:25 | |
| define 708:24 719:17 | 624:9,11 625:20 632:13 | developing 665:7 731:7 733:26 779:21 | director 687:20 701:25 |
| defined 522:10 533:15, | 633:25 665:6 696:19 700:18 723:21 736:22 | development 665:17, | 712:22 714:22 717:7 776:9 |
| 19 540:28 687:28 714:24 | 743:25 756:15 767:23 | 20 | directors 695:6,13 |
| defines 520:21 | describes 519:24 621:15 622:4 672:8 | diagram 530:25,26 | 698:2 703:4 713:9,15 |
| definition 528:25 | 789:17 | dialogue 589:12 | 719:2 |
| 651:20 711:14 713:4 | describing 574:18 | Dick 704:22 | disadvantage 602:16 |
| 714:5 721:9 756:22 | 623:11 624:17 | Diego 586:20 675:22 743:19 | disagree 593:11 594:10 605:21 608:27 |
| degree 588:1 614:3 615:2 617:21 710:28 | description 533:25 556:18 654:1 702:13 | differ 535:9 771:25 | 609:7 615:9 651:7 |
| 767:23 | 736:21 756:23 | difference 650:14 | 774:4 |
| deliver 522:18 694:17 | descriptions 756:19 | 674:3 774:11 | disagreement 609:16 |
| 714:14 | 779:21 | differences 673:17 | disallowed 641:15 |
| delivering 561:3 696:20,23 | designated 620:11 641:28 | different-than- | disasters 701:6 |
| delve 713:5 | designation 737:3 | expected 655:22 | discharged 632:20 713:14 |
| demographic 769:9 | designation 737.3 | differently 776:26 | discipline 700:15 |
| demographic 769:9 | desire 735:11 | differs 564:19 785:11 | 701:2 |
| | desire 733.11 desired 731:23 | difficult 528:28 596:3 | disciplined 761:26 |
| demonstration 703:28 712:7 | desired 731:23 desk 665:15 | 606:12 608:4 682:14 708:26 733:11 | disclosed 613:14 |
| demonstrations | desk 665:15 desperate 768:16 | difficulty 608:21 | disclosing 610:16 |
| 717:13 | • | digesting 586:27 | disclosure 613:14 |
| denial 675:22 | destroying 596:22 | dilemma 765:20 | disclosures 634:1 |
| denied 630:22,26 | detail 532:26 591:16 593:1 651:21 | dilute 599:19 | discomfort 765:15,20, |
| denominator 675:1 | details 530:7 613:13 | dilutes 599:16 | 28 |
| deny 582:12 | 626:6,25 669:13 672:1 | diminishment 789:9 | discontentment 608:24 |
| department 703:23 737:18 | 699:12,17,26 721:22 724:1 752:2 | Dippo 787:19,25 788:8, 22 790:11,12 | discount 673:21,26 674:7 |
| | | | |

discuss 687:20 754:17

discussed 614:28 616:25 618:19 703:9 762:10

discussing 531:5 618:11 676:12 779:3

discussion 555:20 583:3 681:4 790:21,24 791:23

discussions 589:25 590:16 676:20 736:24

disentangle 730:27

dispense 594:4

disposed 615:20

disposition 552:7

disruption 554:15

distaste 765:15

distinct 583:13

distinction 783:26

distinguish 558:2 777:26

distinguishes 560:16 563:26

distress 649:9.23

distribution 677:8

707:15

dive 693:11

diverge 738:10

diverged 738:14,20

diversity 708:11 709:4 768:27 769:1,2,3,9,10, 15,16,26,27 770:6,9

dives 709:21

dividend 547:3

dividends 546:27 551:14 635:3 661:3.9 662:15 741:27

divorce 716:12

divulge 753:16

docket 765:24

document 519:20 520:20 522:22 545:17 546:9 550:1 592:26 593:17 620:18 628:2 633:12,13,26 634:6,7, 11 635:1,23,26 636:20 640:13 642:7 733:9,22, 24,25 734:12,25 735:10,20,26 736:9,10 791:28

documents 539:6,9 548:11 597:10 749:6,9 753:8,14 755:23

dollar 549:25 563:15 564:14 617:9 674:5

dollars 541:5 592:23 604:25 605:14 673:10, 19 716:1 741:7 744:22

double 743:9

doubling 693:9,10

doubt 622:20

downgraded 649:11

DR-5 517:24

draft 581:3

dramatically 740:5

draw 537:9 726:28

drawing 672:26

dream 658:27

drill 659:4

drive 559:8,13 768:5 775:24 777:13

driven 526:4,5 559:3 607:10 742:5,6

driver 528:5

drives 745:25 782:25

driving 772:1

drop 611:11 649:8,22

drove 751:8 755:10 782:4

due 545:21 689:11 740:7 757:8

effectively 544:16 653:12 723:3 748:6 776:27

effectiveness 580:20

effects 603:9

emergence 523:12,16 524:21 532:8 541:19 557:7 560:17,21 562:12,17 563:4 565:14,19 614:12 621:17 622:10 634:6 672:7 695:7

enhanced 707:21

769:11

769:20

| ebruary 28, 2020 | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| emerges 643:18 | ensure 553:15 566:7 653:26 662:9 666:22 | equivalent-sized | 677:7 688:27 689:12,21 690:3 691:5 707:25 716:11 723:13 729:24 | |
| emerging 754:7 | 725:16 736:15 751:9 | errata 686:10,13 | | |
| emission 790:4 | 755:22 757:9 | error 706:23 | everybody's 670:7 | |
| emissions 789:11,14 | ensures 733:3 | escalate 752:21 | everyone's 661:17 | |
| emotional 766:2 | entered 536:11 541:18 601:13,14 602:2,4 | | 706:13 | |
| emphasized 721:5 | · | essence 543:17 549:17 | evidence 740:14 | |
| employ 653:26 | entering 537:7 | essential 609:2 725:15 | 741:20 751:7 | |
| employed 712:23 | enterprise 591:11 775:20 776:4,28 781:5, | essentially 522:15 535:10 536:25 542:19 553:28 673:9 674:26 | evidentiary 516:10 | |
| employee 705:19,21 | 9 | | exact 571:23 578:17 584:12 | |
| 711:1,17 758:10 | entire 521:28 585:9 659:27 666:9 720:9,21, 28 | 675:1 | EXAMINATION | |
| employees 693:8,22 698:1 705:23 706:19 | | establish 735:20 | 516:22 666:5 671:5 | |
| 710:9 731:18 743:14,21 746:24 748:19 749:12, | entirety 645:10 | established 648:22 650:26 736:18 | 674:15 684:20 775:1 783:16 787:24 | |
| 15,19,27 | entities 602:2 694:8 | estate 767:8 | examine 755:10 | |
| employer 711:17 | entitled 535:15 536:13 545:17 772:14 | estimate 641:25 645:2, 4,14 679:16,24 | 787:19 examined 677:18 | |
| enable 582:9 709:11 | entity 626:13 | estimated 679:13,25 | 755:14 | |
| encourage 765:5 | entrenched 596:13 | estimates 673:14 | examining 517:6 | |
| encouraged 712:6 | 598:8 765:9 | estimation 648:4 | examples 637:15 | |
| end 564:26 565:9 648:18 649:28 670:14 688:5 735:1 739:13 | environment 527:12 528:8,28 558:1 560:12 662:27 675:21 689:28 690:5 691:9 726:3 | etched 779:20 | 753:21 759:3,4,7 | |
| | | ethical 692:22 765:19 | exceed 574:10 669:2 680:4 | |
| 742:1 | | ethics 737:8,10,17 783:20 | exceeded 632:3 | |
| endorse 657:22 | 745:25 | | Excel 563:25 | |
| energy 561:3,24,26 580:16 608:6 647:24 687:14 696:21 705:6 779:17 | environmental 520:4 689:6 719:11 | ethnic 769:10 770:8 | excerpts 518:1,15 | |
| | envision 566:27 568:23 571:13 573:5 | evaluate 634:2 656:5 | excess 700:6 | |
| | | 668:3 | excessive 720:16 | |
| enforce 773:19 | 734:20 764:23 | evaluated 563:13 | | |
| enforceability 653:24 | envisioning 566:11 | 695:14 | exchange 536:16 688:1 711:24 712:13 | |
| enforceable 658:2 | 668:25 | evaluating 573:20 585:13 673:22 | excluded 641:16,17 | |
| enforced 653:28 | EOC 723:23 | evaluation 630:23 | excludes 674:26 | |
| enforcement 754:4,5 | EPUC 518:2 620:10 679:7 | 675:16 688:11 | exclusive 717:21 | |
| engage 589:15 676:20 | equal 675:4,6 | evaporated 648:28 | exclusively 654:16 | |
| 768:18 | equation 742:13 | evasion 720:1 | excuse 661:26 685:12 690:21 767:11 | |
| engaged 693:14 786:11 | equipment 594:23 | event 562:15 563:2,14, 21 564:16 567:11,26 568:9 570:1 648:8 656:10 661:1 764:15,16 776:10 779:26 | | |
| engagement 709:17 786:15 | 708:1 equity 564:28 575:21, | | excused 683:14 724:9 785:28 790:15 | |
| enhance 700:16 | 24,28 576:7 585:21 | | execute 560:20 639:22 | |
| | 599:11 635:6,16 660:19 | | | |

Index: emerges..executed

executed 541:12

563:19,20 565:15,20 600:7,22 602:7 603:10 591:5 628:26 649:25 724:6 776:3

events 562:11,23

599:11 635:6,16 660:19

667:8,15,28 668:1,5

equivalent 554:1

execution 601:18 689:20 723:13

executive 664:6 722:7, 10 729:3 772:27 780:2

executives 606:2 721:18

exercise 665:8

exercised 779:26

exhibit 517:16,17,19, 22,23,25,28 518:1,4,11, 17 519:11 521:16 522:26 523:5 534:4,5, 24 539:21 542:7 543:7 544:2 545:5,6,16 556:27 580:18 591:22 592:28 604:7 609:19 628:21 633:21 640:27 671:9,11 672:5 685:18 698:20 735:4 790:28

exhibits 516:27 517:3, 8,14 539:4,7,14 619:22 685:9,24 686:3,17 694:4 695:26,27 731:9

exist 650:15 746:2 756:24,26,27

existing 577:12 650:21

exists 729:26

exit 532:7,12,15,18 533:10 539:15 541:13, 28 543:21,22 544:10 551:18 553:16 554:23, 26 577:18 579:8 582:9 598:20 603:26 604:10 605:6 622:22 643:22 644:2 666:28 762:15

expand 568:3 585:28 639:11 688:14 690:23

expansion 532:26

expect 522:4 527:28 558:12,22 567:23 595:16 608:1 637:18 657:13 732:9 757:21 772:20

expectation 604:8 621:15

expectations 653:20 660:26 710:23

expected 538:24 541:18 638:12 639:1

expecting 771:9

expects 557:6 638:6 672:6

expenditures 641:16 761:27

expense 604:1

expenses 574:24 642:11

expensive 703:19

experience 650:6 679:20,22 713:10 717:4 727:7,8,12,15 728:1,27, 28 729:1,2,4,5,14,17 730:10 756:13,15 757:10,17 769:15 770:24 775:23 777:21, 22 779:20

experienced 597:15 649:14 739:8 777:11

experiences 728:7 769:19

expertise 777:25

experts 688:16,17,20 700:28 729:10 769:13 777:27,28

expiration 665:9

expire 669:6

explain 532:21 535:23 543:1 546:28 556:8 561:7 563:22 570:2 577:11 674:23 763:25 791:16

explore 606:9 658:5

exploring 662:1

explosion 716:16 720:13

expressed 562:7

extend 698:6

extended 702:13

extending 651:17

extensive 612:16 672:12

extensively 564:6 612:5 666:21 667:12 740:22

extent 543:5,7 544:8 574:13 610:27 615:14 638:24 640:5 658:20 666:24 667:16 746:2 755:11,13 784:1

external 782:15

externally 730:13

extra 587:24

eye 697:1

F

facility 548:18 549:12, 13,14,18,20 550:10 552:27 553:1,14 555:2

facing 763:3

fact 568:14 599:20 603:2,3 617:18 688:15 695:18 697:12 699:27 708:20 712:5 736:23 746:16 753:12 759:15 769:5 785:14

factor 562:26 676:17 742:10

factors 561:22 564:14 565:8 588:28 589:22 590:7 636:28 637:7 676:3,11 739:1 741:16 742:7,9 777:22

facts 563:5

factual 599:10

failed 707:28 742:20,21

failing 594:23 658:1

failure 658:10 708:5 715:6 757:7 759:23,28 781:7

failures 710:8 742:22

fair 593:3 611:10 612:17 618:25 623:13, 21,22 624:7,26 627:19 644:10,12 649:10,19 650:6 652:11,12 653:7, 28 655:4 657:1 659:9 692:25 693:19 726:13 765:9 766:16

fairly 705:13

fall 644:14 689:21 690:3

falling 732:8

falsification 749:6,8 755:23

falsifications 753:8

falsified 597:10 749:20 750:6

falsify 750:5,9 753:14

familiar 519:19 547:10 607:14 699:11 720:19, 20 728:12 765:22 778:2

familiarize 699:25

families 594:21,28

fashion 713:19 714:28 737:4

fast 743:16

faster 732:17

favorable 675:10

fear 606:3

February 516:2 518:10,16 521:20 634:8 698:22

federal 597:9 704:16 707:20

feedback 656:22,24

feel 587:24 611:28 615:26 657:21 668:6 716:26 728:16,17 757:11 759:7,23 761:21 763:9 765:20 766:3 768:10 772:11,12 774:15

feelings 766:4

fees 592:14 593:1 641:26 642:11 643:10, 14,16,19,26 644:22,28 645:3,6,7 646:2 651:26 654:23 659:20 679:7, 10,14,25 680:3

felt 612:7 705:2 750:14

FERC 705:7 712:26 731:26

FFO-TO-DEBT 670:10 674:28 675:7,11

fiduciary 694:20,23,25 713:14,27 714:1,11,12, 22 715:3,18 719:9

field 693:10 706:24 726:1,22

figure 522:12,13 534:27 543:27 571:19, 23 578:17,19 631:20 636:7 643:4 644:21 645:9 677:9 780:8,19

figures 523:20 572:1 590:24 593:12 640:20 641:8,14 643:11

file 521:13 569:9 668:24 752:13

filed 583:25 629:19 648:25 649:5 654:6,21 786:19

filing 530:14 569:10 570:27 576:19 577:5 578:7 650:2 672:24 698:22

filings 556:17 655:18

fill 752:23

filling 752:18

final 645:4 669:22 680:10,16 690:22

finalize 669:13

finalized 541:24 662:6

finalizing 573:18 626:1 668:23

finally 723:8 775:21

finance 541:28 543:16 566:21 568:13 607:6 623:5 697:13,26 698:4 701:23 702:10

financed 630:12

finances 530:4 549:25 592:22

financial 521:24 527:8, 23 528:9,26 530:7 549:26 554:14 556:9,11 558:9 559:3 560:10,20 562:14,22 566:1,18

567:14 571:4 572:28 578:27 586:12 594:15 597:7 600:4 602:17 610:8,10,15 617:13 622:9,27 623:20 633:12,22,26 634:4,5, 20 635:23 637:10 640:13 641:26 649:9, 14,23 650:5 656:28 658:17,20 666:22 675:24 700:15 715:10 718:8,15,24 719:14 720:11,16,24 721:6,13 724:27 739:1 745:3 778:3 781:24

financially 523:11,16 524:19,23,28 525:8 526:2,24 527:5,9,22

financiallydisciplined 708:18

financials 530:15 533:16 588:2 601:5 609:25 636:23 745:8

financing 531:14 532:7 533:3 542:20 543:18, 21,23,28 548:6,8 553:13 554:21,26 555:8,9,12,15 556:13 566:7,9 567:19 576:20, 22 578:3,8,10 603:26 607:5,8 621:22 623:3,7 624:28 634:16 644:25 643:14,26 644:22,28 645:11,14,16,17,19,23, 26 646:3,25,27 655:27 660:15,18 678:15 679:9,25 680:5

financing-related

644:13

find 653:21 667:19 708:1,27 709:19 723:24 754:24 755:4

fine 623:18 753:5

finish 555:25

finished 735:9 756:4 771:21

finite 725:26

Finkelstein 619:1,2,5,7 620:1 621:1,4,7 623:25 624:1 626:28 628:22

629:27 630:2 633:19 647:6,11 680:20 683:9, 10

Finkelstein's 626:10

fire 552:16 563:8 564:11 589:2,17,21 595:10 617:9,14 628:26 629:9,12 631:22,24 632:28 633:4,8 649:15 671:10,20 678:20 682:16,18,21 743:6,23 757:1 760:25

fires 598:11 608:17 617:11 628:15,16 629:15,20 632:9,10,23 656:8 671:25 675:24 677:15 742:22 743:10, 14,27 744:3,20,21 757:8 789:8,9

firewall 573:6

firm 642:26 768:19

firms 642:19 643:1 706:17 756:18

first-hand 597:15

first-priority 547:20 548:21

fit 532:22 751:10 764:14

Fitch 558:13,23

fits 780:9

five-and-eight-year 535:10

five-year 521:24 558:11,22 559:14 560:17 578:5,14

fixed 609:9.10

fixing 710:19

flat 561:25

flexibility 575:19 615:2

flip 533:18

flipping 671:14

flow 519:24 530:24 568:6 570:14 635:27 636:2 640:8

flowed 639:4

flowing 637:10

Index: FFO-TO-DEBT..form

flows 566:13 582:20

focus 561:16 562:28 564:7 589:16 637:26 690:26 691:17 698:26 705:17 706:12,14 720:16 724:2,3 725:8 730:11 742:10 768:8 770:2,9 784:20

focused 557:12 564:12 565:19 651:17 691:12, 15 708:19,27 754:6 772:2

focusing 709:26

folks 519:14 588:17 701:27 732:15 769:26 781:24

follow 536:6 743:19 776:17

follow-up 556:6 673:1 737:2 745:22 776:15 777:15 779:2

follow-ups 791:8

footing 789:23

footnote 546:1,20 569:26 576:18,25 664:26.27

footnoted 629:10

footnotes 699:3

forced 580:27

forecast 521:25 639:15 640:2.6 641:4 658:11

forecasted 521:23 639:23 655:28

foregoing 579:14,17

foremost 690:11 739:4 770:4 772:17

foreseeable 732:6

forget 546:8

forgo 681:5

form 518:15 551:16 573:6 698:22 734:25 736:3 739:20 744:5 752:23 759:26 761:3 773:2

formed 705:16

forthcoming 581:15 656:18

forward 528:9,18,24 559:4 593:18,23 625:3 626:3 631:13 656:6 660:23 666:20,23 667:11 669:26,28 672:12 673:20 674:14 709:15 710:7,20 729:17 790:6

found 535:1 597:10 698:21 700:21 740:3,9 749:26 752:7,16

foundation 590:10 592:20,26 594:1 762:23,26 763:22

foundational 722:13

fourth 705:21 756:8

Francisco 516:1 555:22

frankly 701:9 703:24, 27 739:4

free 603:11 675:11 711:28 713:16

Friday 767:2

front 523:20 571:19 572:2 574:10 663:16,17 787:26

fulfill 722:4

fulfilling 694:25 722:26

fulfills 692:15 694:22 721:28

full 544:20 610:23 652:1 692:23 693:18 768:17

fuller 719:23

fully 667:11 761:9 781:24 782:2

fulsome 756:21

function 783:24

functionally 626:15

functions 780:20

fund 544:11 554:19 570:7 577:22 586:8,16

645:22 646:26 652:5,8 761:26

fundamental 696:20 715:13 749:3

fundamentally 609:6

fundamentals 708:16

funded 537:28 578:24

funding 531:9,10 570:10 646:4,28

funds 519:24 520:9,25 521:3 522:11 592:12 593:7 597:28 670:3,9 773:24

fungible 784:7

future 579:6 591:4 594:22 617:13 625:17, 27 626:19 639:24 644:1 646:24 657:19,26 658:11 661:25 675:26 676:2 677:7 732:6 733:5 769:22

futures 594:15

G

G&e 759:16

gain 560:10

gained 575:20

gap 597:14

gas 522:16,18 586:20 607:3 675:22 684:8 707:14,15 716:15 720:18 743:19 760:14 777:7 787:3,7 789:10, 14

gases 789:8

gather 732:12

gave 752:8 753:20

Geesman 555:27 556:1,3,28 557:2 558:20 559:6 568:11 577:28 579:28 580:2 587:4 678:7 681:15,17, 27 695:23,24 696:5,7, 10 704:6 gender 768:28

general 578:21 637:6 662:7 687:22 737:2,9, 11,13,15,21,22 751:3 753:10 785:15,20

generally 523:26 524:15 537:18 540:15 586:22 589:18 593:13 604:27 651:11 693:16 716:14

generate 613:17

generated 568:7 570:8 699:21

generation 698:7 699:10

GHG 520:5

give 611:3 614:18 629:22 690:18 699:5 712:18 720:2 733:18 735:9 744:26 747:1 755:16 758:1 761:23 762:20 781:16

giving 561:19 733:11 752:2,27 755:27 756:19

globally 533:13

Glynn 763:19

goal 695:9 738:26 769:24 770:1 773:21 775:16 776:1

goals 718:8,16,19 789:20,21,22,28

gobbled 597:28

going-forward 637:19

good 516:24 518:25 556:4,5 580:3,9,13,14 584:6 611:28 619:6 647:22 663:6,10 684:22 687:11,12 692:8 696:8, 9,28 697:15 703:27 704:12 722:28 723:5 724:9 726:9 728:21 738:6 743:20 745:9 752:10,12 759:9 768:3 781:17 789:23

goods 694:9 701:17

Gordon 763:20

governance 694:7 703:28 709:25

government 768:22

government's 754:6

governor 593:20 658:3 704:22

grade 523:22 524:12,16 525:19,22 526:21 527:1,18 528:1,15,26 529:3,6,7,13 557:5,6, 12,20 558:10,24 559:25 560:14,23,25 586:15 604:13,14,21,22 621:16,23 648:22,23 649:1,4,12,13 671:2

grant 540:10 606:14 664:25

granted 626:17

granting 581:4

granular 629:14 776:8

graph 641:9

grasping 745:14

great 519:9 524:17 546:17 592:28 608:22 658:19 693:15 695:3

greater 535:8 606:20, 24 607:24 608:8 648:9 700:14 706:12 710:28 745:3 747:13 761:13,23

greenhouse 789:8,10,

Grid 775:11

grieved 756:6

group 583:24 726:18

grow 522:5

growing 578:23

growth 521:23 522:1 577:22 578:9,18 641:5

guarantee 565:27

guaranteed 723:4

guess 551:9 597:1,4 614:18 618:18 658:27 665:18 682:22 726:13

guidance 658:6

580:10 581:28 586:1

587:8,12 591:26 594:7

595:28 600:28 612:21

614:6 619:3,23 623:25

627:1 629:27 647:6,13

663:1,6 665:24 671:13

676:21 678:5 680:20

681:6,27 682:2,5,10

683:12 686:27 687:8

691:26,28 695:21,24 704:4,9 724:16 783:15

21,27 788:25 790:8

784:24,28 785:2 786:8,

I.19-06-015. 583:9 585:5

Index: guy..identified

identification 516:26

518:4,7,11,14,17 580:18 685:1,8,21 686:8 687:19 730:9

identified 536:2 537:4 542:26 628:27 645:7 656:1 658:2 686:16

guy 704:25

н

half 538:21 578:24,25 606:15,16

hand 608:5,7,21 644:21 752:2 787:6

handle 730:2

hands 617:27

happen 574:10 677:28 690:6 718:22 722:22 750:10,28 751:9 753:11 780:1

happened 721:5 759:1

happening 551:17 759:16

happier 704:20

happy 522:24 719:21 728:4 759:12

hard 528:3 595:9 653:21 656:16,23 661:22 667:21 689:24 693:23 700:20 706:8 763:6 771:23

hardening 690:15

harder 562:26

harm 657:7 658:12

hasty 593:25

hate 704:24

hazardous 689:6 691:8

head 584:27 707:16 736:24 759:10

headed 756:28

heading 627:8 633:21 634:16 636:24 642:10 664:6,9

heads 751:6

health 622:10 634:5

healthcare 759:1

healthy 523:11,16 524:20,23,28 525:8 526:2,25 527:5,9,22 highly 530:1,5,8

hike 606:10

hikes 605:18,20,24 606:14

hire 701:28

hired 688:17

hiring 701:7

historical 641:8.14

650:11

idea 662:14 687:22

517:2,7,16,19,22,25,28

703:1 707:21 720:14 770:3 781:22 **identify** 517:14 531:9 566:5 637:7 638:1 700:13 735:20.26 781:8 identifying 780:28 781:1 782:8 **ignited** 596:20 **ignore** 752:13 ignoring 725:20 **illegal** 597:16 illustrate 738:23 illustrated 720:24 imagination 734:13 imagine 611:26 715:23 724:26 738:18 immediately 524:21 531:1 532:18 533:9 541:13,18 **impact** 607:8 615:17 639:17,24 648:10 670:1 674:19 676:9 678:26 689:1 696:15 723:21 impacted 601:16 662:25 726:23 **impacting** 589:1,22 **impacts** 589:14 603:12 689:6 691:9 713:11 714:26 743:17 impair 562:11 713:21 impairing 562:16 563:3 imperfect 723:14 724:7 implement 653:12 implication 675:8 implications 589:10 600:10,24 602:18 612:28 720:8 implying 627:24 **import** 756:10

importance 730:24

important 526:3

545:25 552:12 610:6,20 612:4 623:24 653:16 659:26 675:18 722:20 726:26 727:5,23 730:20 731:21 735:16 745:11 746:19 768:28 769:17 770:5 783:26 786:14 imposed 734:7 **improve** 603:26 688:12,13 689:25 725:19 749:3 775:8 improved 768:10 improvement 586:11 689:20 697:19 **improving** 557:8 586:6 622:5 708:28 imprudent 677:16 inadequate 740:20 742:4 inarticulate 727:13 inaudible 567:10 incented 746:22 748:19 **incentive** 664:10,14 722:11,16,19 723:3,6 784:14,15 **incentives** 746:3,7,8 incidences 749:25 753:12 764:21

incident 716:21 750:1 incidents 705:12 706:2 include 535:22 540:12, 19,22,24 557:28 567:24 576:7,10,15 601:15 611:20,21 631:21,23 633:7 641:11,15 662:8 672:24 686:13 711:25 included 522:11 537:12,27 550:15 576:4 591:11 675:3 678:22 **includes** 520:24 537:23 546:20 556:12 665:2 693:8 712:14 727:4 767:8 784:16 including 546:26

Index: identify..innovate 572:20 686:10 688:17 industrial 687:16 692:16 702:9 711:26.27 689:2,9,18 690:5,27 691:7 775:22 724:3 734:8 755:26 incoming 777:12 industrials 727:16 incorporate 656:22 industries 759:15 incorporated 600:12, **industry** 581:22 589:10 720:28 729:14 758:14, 19 759:2 768:21 770:23 incorrect 525:24 778:7,23 779:5,6,12,17 increase 521:27 560:3 ineffectual 743:11 561:28 595:7 597:6 inefficient 700:22 605:3,7,9 615:5 636:10 638:12 639:1 675:5 inexcusable 720:27 725:8 768:8 769:6,8 inexpensive 741:25 increased 604:26 605:1 608:7,20 728:2 **infancy** 731:8 735:8 760:19,23 **infant** 736:9 increases 595:20.21 **influence** 665:19,21 609:6 638:16 639:18 711:23 675:6 706:22 760:21 761:23,25 inform 709:11,12 710:6 781:15 increasing 761:13 information 610:9 incredible 554:15 688:7,11,14 690:18 incumber 521:2 701:10 732:3 753:17 781:18 incur 637:19 informed 705:3 **incurred** 616:13 643:16,20,22 644:6 **informs** 709:14 710:15 654:24 655:9 infrastructure 638:13, incurring 637:17 19 697:7 711:3 720:18 660:14 739:17.27 740:11.17.23 741:22 742:21 763:4 independence 687:20 688:12,13 736:23 infusion 576:7 independent 711:8,15, inherent 766:2 18,20,22 712:3,12,14, inherently 735:19 22 713:4 736:16 761:20 766:25,28 780:7,12,13 782:14 initial 701:6 indicative 524:28 initially 568:26 630:12 525:8 526:24 527:5 initiated 698:6 indicator 759:24 initiative 730:21 indirectly 538:8 775:20 individual 632:8 698:1 initiatives 698:17 individually 767:6 **injuries** 658:11

inked 613:3 771:17

innovate 746:4

individuals 602:7

714:18 750:19

inputs 708:23 **inquiry** 695:25 inspect 740:22 752:8 inspection 747:5 inspections 707:28 740:20,24,28 inspirational 758:12 inspire 757:20 758:1 inspiring 757:23 instability 564:9 **instance** 564:3 730:3 734:25 751:13,14 instances 740:13 753:9 755:1 instructed 660:6 instrument 551:21 554:24 558:3,4 **instruments** 541:15.17 551:8,15 insurance 534:2 543:20 551:16 552:9, 12,16,22,25 553:4,14, 26 554:4,26 555:14 588:18,19 589:2,6,9,16, 23 590:3,10,16,25 591:3,4,5,6,16 597:24, 28 632:4 **insurers** 589:19 integrate 768:15 integrated 702:8 782:10 integrity 692:22 693:18,25 intelligence 702:6

intend 521:12 544:14 565:25 573:14 574:1 598:25 645:13 646:11, 26 660:15 661:6 668:24 intended 544:7 547:16

552:21 553:5,6,16,19 639:21 680:11 682:20

intending 621:28 646:1.6 667:28 672:23

intends 621:26 625:21

intense 693:11

intent 554:7,10,28 577:11 616:7 625:18

intention 551:19 582:25 613:15 614:25 615:12 625:25 626:2 666:26 725:18

intentional 749:10.16 intentionally 750:5

intentions 653:19 654:4

interact 709:16

interest 536:22 548:21 553:20 574:23 581:8 604:1,25 605:14 606:20 609:1 610:24 612:8 647:3 650:7,8,13,22 652:21 653:4,10 660:16 661:12 670:8 673:8 687:27 696:15 712:19 713:20 714:2 715:20 716:4 717:10,19 729:6 738:9,14 742:17 772:7

interested 651:19,28

interesting 618:15

interests 571:21 661:17 711:20 715:2, 20,21 716:6 717:9,16, 17 719:3 738:13 740:15 743:4,6,26 744:3,17,18, 23 761:12 767:7 789:2

interference 736:17.26

interject 581:13 629:16 734:26

internally 730:13

interpret 627:23 637:4

interpretation 554:6 660:3,7

interpreted 697:1

interrelated 548:12

interrupt 522:20 701:15

intervenor 673:14,24 674:3

intervenors 731:17

introduces 564:9 676:15

invest 577:20 742:6

investigate 751:3

investigating 754:22

investigation 516:11 580:26 583:1 585:1 631:3 646:17 676:7,8 682:25 750:26,27 751:14,15,28 754:23 755:2,6

investigations 749:24 751:27 752:3 755:8,20 783:24

investing 741:22

investment 522:16 523:22 524:16 525:19. 22 526:21 528:1,15,26 529:3,6,7 557:4,6,12,20 558:10,24 559:25 560:14,23,25 586:15 595:3,5,17 598:9,24 604:14,21 606:21 607:11,25 608:23 610:18 611:12,13 615:5 621:16,23 638:13 648:21,23 649:4,12,13 671:2 745:4 761:1,14

investment-grade 670:18 672:6,10

investments 598:18, 22,26 740:17

investor 607:24 738:25 740:15 742:17 743:25 772:26

investor-owned

523:19 524:1,6,11 526:25 694:8

investors 596:13 598:8 606:24,28 607:19,22 608:3 615:8 637:13 649:28 741:10,21 742:18 743:28 745:5 765:10 769:14 773:22,

involve 586:7

involved 578:16 660:2 665:11 705:6 731:24 762:9 764:19 766:10

involvement 665:6

Index: inputs...John

irrespective 563:16

IRS 570:14

ISOC 780:23 782:17,22, 26

issue 539:15 540:3,11, 13 543:5,8 558:23 569:18 598:25 615:12 621:26,28 651:1,3,8 672:22 701:11 703:12 706:15 715:27 716:17 718:1,27 737:18 742:16 760:15 768:12 769:15

issued 544:15 566:27 568:13 611:6 616:27 634:7

issuer 604:12,21

issues 654:22 656:17 667:3 700:24 705:18 706:20,26 710:12,14 723:26 734:8 740:1,19 742:15 745:15 752:6 753:28 754:1 763:3,5 781:13

issuing 598:20 605:6 661:3

item 535:14 537:13 541:4,26 542:4,7 543:26 544:28 545:1,25 575:16

items 516:18 520:28 532:20 535:21 536:2 537:3 542:20,27 572:28 583:21

J

January 628:11 642:15 643:10 648:26 650:2 654:21

JASON 516:6

Jessica 787:7,14

job 691:17 736:21 746:25 756:19,23 767:13 779:21

iobs 756:1

John 663:15,24 696:10 724:1

Johnson 669:23,25 728:10 757:18,28 758:7 783:23 785:18

Johnson's 611:22 653:22 654:17 728:20 757:26

joined 584:4 704:26

Jose 592:7

Jr 763:19

judge 516:4,12,14,15 556:7 581:2 733:7 766:7 786:24

judges 763:11

judgment 528:11,14 563:2 675:14 757:12

judicial 731:12 734:3

Julie 783:22

jumpers 742:20

June 581:15 772:3

junk 604:16,22

junk-level 604:9

jurisdiction 601:2

justification 733:11

justify 656:14

K

K-R-A-V-A-T-H 642:25

Kane 736:14 785:10 790:26

keeping 732:19 742:18

Kelly 518:20,21,23
520:18 522:21,24,28
523:4 525:4,12,16,20
526:6,14,17 528:20
529:4 531:24 534:3,13,
15 537:16 538:2,22
539:1,2,10 540:26
542:2,4,10,13,16
544:25 545:8,10,20
546:17 547:18,27 548:3
549:7 550:7,8 551:1
555:16,24 557:11
558:18 609:22 641:3
678:5 682:4,5 692:4,5,7

695:20

key 670:2 705:1

killing 596:21

kind 565:6 578:23 650:16 764:15 765:19 779:15 781:17,25 782:9

kinds 651:27 711:25 716:10 730:10,11 731:15 736:5 781:8

King 783:22

knew 696:10 763:1

knowing 528:13 653:5

knowledge 528:11 602:1 613:25 635:18 639:25 672:18 686:25 788:20

knowledgeable 693:14

Kravath 642:24

L

label 636:27

labor 729:5

lack 642:22 659:25 762:25

lacking 682:22

lacks 590:9 592:19,26 593:28 762:22

lagging 759:24

large 580:15 616:19 643:19 672:16 687:14, 16 690:26 691:6,12 699:14 768:20

large-scale 727:6,11

largely 573:19,24 649:26 738:14 786:12

larger 583:8,18 675:20

largest 581:21,23

late 561:25 649:15

law 516:4,12,14,15 652:23 704:23,24 714:6,24 737:18 786:24 lawyer 704:17

lax 767:1

lead 606:23 676:1 764:16 773:27

leader 759:14 771:1 777:6 778:5

leadership 757:23 758:9

leading 678:6 708:1 720:12 744:1

leads 729:19

learned 706:4

learning 709:10

leave 618:17 691:23 774:21

led 729:13

left 516:16 738:8 765:3

left-hand 636:26

legal 547:23 626:13 692:24 693:19 714:8 737:18,19 765:4 783:24 785:15

legally 610:13,15 626:15 754:23

legislated 734:2

lend 564:23

lender 727:19

lenders 727:20

lens 673:22

letter 539:21,23 540:28 548:1,19,20 550:21,22 655:18,25 667:28

letters 539:19 541:3,23 576:5 579:26 702:16 765:23.27

level 538:5 540:6 544:21 550:12 551:4 552:17 566:5,6 591:15 605:9 607:11 693:9 700:27 701:25 709:7,17 721:21 728:1 772:23 775:20 776:25 777:11 781:9

levels 607:5,8 789:26

liability 591:3 632:4 716:1

Index: Johnson..loan

Liccardo 592:6 604:8

lie 755:17

lien 599:12

liens 598:14,17,27 599:4,6,9 610:28 611:1 678:14,16

life 578:28 742:23

light 709:25 789:7

likelihood 745:3

limit 678:6 774:1

limitation 653:3

limitations 617:5 653:7 773:17

limited 545:22 651:9 681:14 682:7 747:5 752:8

lines 538:18 556:25 557:3 561:1 562:9 565:22 572:17 574:21 575:18 585:19 586:4 588:20 609:16 625:19 651:17 673:7 677:19 690:17 696:18,22 700:11 702:11 723:10 730:23 786:20

link 588:16 648:4

linkage 624:16

list 519:28 520:28 523:9 531:6 546:3 580:28 619:25 628:25 652:1 693:25 698:13,15 727:5 733:27 734:22 781:19

listed 628:15 629:20 637:3,15 640:19 642:19 643:5,12 747:20

litigation 603:22

live 608:15 657:24 693:23

lives 588:10 606:16 765:13

living 733:21

loan 537:8 544:12 545:4 553:27 554:1

Index: loans..maximizes

791:21.24

loans 549:11 568:17

local 693:9

Locate 707:13 708:4

long 535:7 544:6 575:8, 10 584:8 611:27 615:11 700:20 704:8,9,11,13 707:8 724:11,14 727:4 731:25 732:27 733:2 761:6 767:2 779:13,15 781:21

long-term 533:7,14,26 534:19 535:4,5 537:19 538:9,12 539:12 543:11,12,23,28 551:8, 20 553:16,19 555:9 568:25 569:20 576:20, 21 577:2,21 664:9,14 712:8 741:25 764:10 773:21,25 784:15

long-winded 761:9

longer 535:23,28 538:23 545:19 581:20 584:20 585:8 624:27 630:16 772:28

longer-term 535:11

looked 563:7 698:17 700:20 702:3 705:18,26 710:4 728:6 739:14 759:13,15

Loretta 762:16

lose 689:3 776:12 778:14,15

loses 576:3 582:21

loss 553:6 564:27 691:10 742:22,23

losses 553:8,11 554:3 567:21 573:20,26 582:5,28 583:6,7,14,16, 25,27 584:10,17 616:12 677:14

lost 689:10,18 739:20

lot 699:28 705:26 717:13 721:10 729:23 731:27 735:14 745:10 747:20 750:24 758:3 759:13 767:8,28 768:21 770:17 771:4,12 773:14 778:14

lots 742:9,14 746:21,22 756:9

low 608:5,18 611:5 729:26 739:13 742:1 761:2

low-coupon 536:21

low-income 769:26

Lowe 663:15 724:1

Lowe's 663:24 664:12

lower 574:23,24 575:3 608:6 639:8 648:27 650:8 670:11,28 671:1 675:1 761:15

lower-cost 536:16

Lucky 704:19

lumpy 669:11

lunch 546:14 629:25

Lynch 762:16 763:2

M

made 547:12 558:12 569:17 571:8 578:6 592:27 606:18 635:16 654:17 669:9 680:10,16 700:19 729:11 731:11, 19,26 733:4,28 734:23 752:5 760:9 769:5 778:1 783:28

magnitude 562:14 631:26

main 542:8 545:26 549:10

maintain 610:26 634:5 700:4 735:27,28 769:11,22

maintained 649:12

maintenance 739:17, 25,26 740:3,10 742:4, 12

major 705:11,19 706:2 718:27 727:14 729:13 757:17 758:14,26,27 760:13,17 764:16 **majority** 644:13 658:16 712:10,15

make 543:20 546:21 548:4 554:18 556:17 569:22 574:14 593:25 607:22 621:8 650:27 654:16 666:3 669:14 690:3 697:16 709:1 719:22 730:4 731:13,16 732:19 734:15 747:2,3 748:21 750:13,18,20 751:10 752:17 755:28 761:2 772:18 774:9 782:2

make-whole 567:25 568:10,15,18,21 569:16

makes 579:11 656:11 735:21,23

making 577:4 578:1 651:28 660:23 676:18 688:15 691:4 731:21 740:26 774:16 781:3

manage 568:20 690:19 697:8 701:12 747:12 748:6 763:11 768:15

managed 613:10 614:18 729:25

management 591:12 613:21,24 687:23,26 688:5,6,21,22 690:16 700:13 702:5 707:22 708:5 709:7,16,17 710:2,7,8,13,18,23 711:3 722:5,27 733:23 740:4 747:11 748:18 749:1 755:25 757:3 767:21 768:4,20 776:7, 24 782:18

manager 560:8 614:21 615:3

manages 748:12

managing 701:25 706:25 726:15

mandatory 535:12 548:27 549:8 552:3

manner 536:27

map 531:6,8

Maratukulam 791:1

March 519:17 571:6

mark 517:15,21,27 518:6,13 707:13 708:4

marked 516:25 517:2, 7,19,25 518:4,11,17 580:18 619:20 620:8 627:3 633:11 635:21 636:14 637:22 640:12, 22 641:19 685:1,8,15, 21,28 686:8 687:19 787:28

market 528:13 551:18 561:5 615:18 651:9 666:22 667:13 676:17 731:27 763:3

marketed 668:1.4

marketplace 699:23 732:1 747:17

markets 544:10 554:15 560:10 589:16,17 617:5 650:5 746:11

mass 759:23,28

massive 715:6 781:6,7

masterfully 592:10

match 660:25

material 562:10,23 565:14 622:15 646:16 686:18 698:11 711:20

materially 565:21

matrix 727:1,4 728:6 731:7 756:17 758:23 770:3

Matt 663:8

matter 622:8 645:1 717:16 746:16

matters 563:18 601:1

mature 571:16

maturities 535:8 568:20 571:9

maturity 568:21 571:16 572:15

maximize 615:13,14 616:10,17

maximizes 614:26

Mayor 592:6 604:8 MCE 518:20 529:18

530:23 549:2 555:23,24 692:4

MCE-X-1 519:11 530:17

Mead 684:8,15

meaning 627:20

means 587:19 617:22, 27 682:23 714:13 737:10,16

meant 569:3

meantime 551:22

measurable 772:21

measure 589:28 590:5, 8,17 735:13 776:27

measured 674:25 776:11,26

measures 589:26 590:6 745:10 772:25

mechanism 657:12 733:18,20 735:11

mechanisms 572:23 667:7,26 733:17

medium 535:9

medium-term 535:5

meet 658:1 736:25 789:25

meeting 703:18 732:19 789:20,22

meetings 703:5,14 726:14,17 736:20 758:10

meets 528:25

member 702:25,27 711:16 712:2 752:4

members 688:3 695:18 712:27 714:1 717:12 777:23.24

memorandum 639:19

mention 682:14

mentioned 542:21 572:27 573:27 583:28 677:7 701:22 708:20,22 712:21 713:26 755:26 756:12 757:15 771:7

mentioning 618:21

mentors 704:21

met 547:20 727:14 732:14

method 667:19

methodology 675:2

metric 677:13 697:22 752:10,12 784:22

metrics 527:8,24,25 557:7,8,12,21,26 558:8 560:23 562:22 586:7,11 664:21 670:2,4,17,19 674:24 681:20 697:26 706:13 747:3,4 750:15 752:7 755:27 764:10 772:26 773:8,12,13 774:12,13,18,19 775:14,24 776:5,18 777:7 784:14,17

mic 658:28

Michael 647:23

Michelle 516:12

microphone 542:6 546:22 555:28 659:11 666:4

middle 532:9 549:10

miles 722:23

milestones 722:18,23 723:1

Miley 663:3,5,8,27,28 665:22 683:11,12

million 538:1,7,19 552:23,25,28 575:2 579:15 631:28 644:22, 24,28 645:8,15 673:15 674:1 679:25 741:7 763:19,20

million-dollar 563:27

mind 572:3 576:24 578:20,21 594:9 601:8 619:8

minimize 568:10,21 569:16 570:12 639:16

minute 520:11 533:18 550:1 585:17

minutes 526:8 545:22 548:2 612:19,22 617:6 690:22 703:3,8,18 774:8

mischaracterizes 554:6,9,28 623:23 757:26

missed 783:27

mission 561:2 696:23 721:14

misstates 525:10 537:25

mistakes 750:18 752:17

mitigate 589:21

mitigated 568:16

mitigation 590:23 638:19 711:2 728:27 756:13,15 784:6 789:11

Mmm-hmm 718:10

mode 700:26

model 607:1 741:24

modeled 571:3

moderate 638:11,12 639:1

modified 564:5

modify 676:14

modifying 676:18

moment 522:21 538:25 584:2 621:22 622:10 699:5 753:20 756:22 767:18 783:8

moments 724:24

Monday 628:2 673:1 790:22 791:3

money 544:18 551:5, 10,11,13,17 554:2 588:9 595:1 672:14

monitor 597:10 707:20

monopolies 746:17

monopoly 694:14 733:1 745:28 746:1,12

monthly 610:9 697:28

months 581:6 612:6

Moody's 558:13,23 681:22

more-detailed 667:6

more-specific 747:24

morning 516:24 518:25 556:4,5 580:9, 13,14 584:6 585:15 619:6 666:9

mortgaged 651:10

motion 519:15 786:5, 19.26

motivate 750:13

motivated 749:21 750:9,27 753:14

motivation 749:23 750:2

motivations 749:26 755:2

motive 749:19

move 605:28 613:2,9 658:15 717:27 721:15 732:28 736:7 738:22 742:27 754:12 760:10 768:26

moved 776:23

moving 596:16 609:20 614:2 729:11 732:17 762:17

multiple 584:13 689:13,18

multiplied 566:6

multitude 589:22

mutually 717:21

mutually-exclusive 715:15

Ν

n/a 752:26

narrowed 579:24

national 561:11,13 775:11

natural 608:9 638:20 746:1,11,17 760:21

nature 543:4 552:21 555:14 631:5 700:9

necessarily 541:20 543:19 602:24 610:23 638:26 643:27 742:5 775:28 779:16

needed 578:4,8 580:22 582:23 606:10 703:20 705:2,17 732:22 757:9 761:27

negative 676:13 743:9

negatives 739:21

neglected 727:24

negotiate 601:26 615:11 764:28 765:17, 21

negotiated 536:15 539:24 564:6 612:5 613:26 614:13 619:10 762:11

negotiating 765:3

negotiations 541:25 612:16 614:19,20,23

neighbor 608:17 618:23,24

neighbors 608:24 761:15

net 552:6 567:21 573:20,26 576:2 582:5, 21,28 583:6,14,15,25, 26 584:9,17 636:6 640:18 656:20 680:4

network 729:1

neutral 518:28 574:15 575:9 582:6 624:12 668:13,27 669:17

neutrality 574:8 575:14

Newsom's 593:20

Nice 775:4,5

night 585:14 587:1

nobody's 623:20

nod 611:9 673:2

nodding 707:16

NOL 669:1

NOLS 568:6,16 570:1, 20 572:20 573:14 574:9 584:20,24 585:4,10

nomenclature 534:11

nominal 673:18

non-bypassable 626:21

Non-gov 756:20

non-investment 527:1,18 529:13

non-rate-basefunded 660:19

nonconfidential 703:3

noncore 636:27 637:7

nonprofit 724:21

Nonresponsive 528:21 547:18

Nora 684:8,15 687:13 728:22

normal 771:3

north 565:7

Northern 609:3

Northstar 688:18,19 782:23

notable 611:15

note 548:16,17 584:3 619:15 760:9 790:1

noteholder 533:14,27 600:8,11,20,23,24 601:12,17,19,26 602:9, 19,25 603:13,20,27 612:26 613:4 643:21 673:11

noteholders 536:15 611:26 619:16

notes 535:11,18,19 536:16 543:12

notice 689:3,12,19 691:10 694:6

notification 689:23 690:12

Nuclear 696:14 702:18 780:11

number 542:3,28 543:2,13 544:1,28 545:22 552:24 564:23 565:1 576:6 588:28 609:9,10 611:16 642:19 657:20 673:28 689:22 690:7 693:9,13 697:25, 28 698:17,27 699:15,28 703:16 723:25 725:27 726:18,21 727:19 732:15 734:7 739:1,28 742:7 752:3,11 769:6 782:2

numbers 564:25 591:9, 14,15,20

0

object 524:13 595:24 736:3 739:19 759:26 773:2

objection 525:10 526:6 528:20 547:18,22 558:16,26 588:21 590:9 592:19,25 593:20,28 599:26 600:15,28 602:20 613:5 614:5 742:25 744:5 757:25 760:5 761:3 762:22 763:22 764:2 766:18

objections 594:5 606:8

objective 561:4 593:22 664:20 696:20 697:24 700:4 767:22 773:8,12

objectives 558:15 693:1,21

obligated 624:27 754:23

obligation 623:8,15 653:11 694:15 734:6,10 791:27

obligations 652:11 693:24 703:26 725:21

observations 706:9

obstacles 759:8

obtain 586:15 630:17

obtained 621:21

obvious 595:23

occur 658:21 661:2 672:9 689:7 691:10 744:20 750:23

occurred 555:20 705:12 739:10,18,27 740:11,13 741:23 749:6 751:2 778:7

occurring 563:20 744:22 771:12 789:16

occurs 554:14 562:25 572:3

October 689:11 707:25 723:13.19

offer 611:19 661:6

offered 716:8

offering 575:1

office 663:9 703:15

Office's 518:9

officer 549:26 556:9 600:4 711:16 737:8,10 775:22 777:12 780:10, 11,13 781:4,16 783:20

officer's 564:5 585:13 676:7.10.23

official 546:9

offset 554:3 647:2 660:16 675:28

offsetting 626:26

oftentimes 606:24

OII 634:17

onboarding 705:10,27 706:1 709:10 710:4

one-affiliate 637:17

ongoing 541:10 614:19 622:11 637:11 695:9 733:21

Oops 685:13 op-ed 592:5

open 651:6 781:18,20 782:3 operate 697:3 operating 561:20 567:21 573:20,26 576:2 582:5,21,28 583:6,14, 16,25,27 584:9,17 638:8 697:17,20 717:1 746:28 776:7 781:21 782:16 operation 670:4 775:7 operational 638:2,6 700:14 725:20 operationalize 775:23 operationalizing 781:2 operations 636:6 640:19 641:11,12,13 706:22 748:1

670:9 708:12,13 768:11 Operator 780:27 opinion 603:2 618:12, 15 710:21 740:8 760:15 766:15 772:14 opportunities 573:21, 23 774:2 opportunity 536:9 610:14 614:20 655:7,8 662:7 668:3 681:14 opposed 528:8 588:5 591:5 609:5 668:2 701:4 722:13 746:8 optimism 659:1 676:1 **option** 665:7 options 580:28 665:2 666:19 667:7 oranges 776:22 order 531:1 532:6 534:27 547:3 551:2 578:22 600:9 613:17 616:12 631:26 705:3 741:26 761:23 776:26 791:5,6 ordered 733:7 734:1,3 orderly 730:9

orders 731:12 organization 708:7 709:1 780:26 785:12 organizational 735:28 origin 632:23 746:12 original 534:22 576:4 629:7 651:13 655:2 Originally 673:20 **outcome** 612:17 731:23 747:14 762:9 outcome-based 784:21 outer 669:7

outcomes 735:13.14 outline 546:7 outlined 536:17 541:15 outlook 521:20 636:16

outsourced 703:17 outstanding 544:27 569:1,5,15 579:5 605:4

output 699:20

outvoted 758:23 overcome 597:17 759:8 **overlap** 731:14

overlay 702:7

overlooked 725:10 726:5,16

oversight 702:18 720:27 725:4 770:5 780:8,11,13 782:11

overstates 608:11 overwhelmed 703:15

owes 687:24

owner 727:22 734:9 781:22 782:6,8

owners 698:2 owns 734:5

P

p.m. 683:17,18 684:1 pace 768:7 Pacific 684:8 760:14

787:3,7

package 665:12,13 pages 620:9 671:14 791:15

paid 538:8 540:4 553:9 554:4 561:18 570:5 588:4 598:5 605:15 607:19 630:11 643:20, 25,27,28 644:2,6,8,10, 16 716:3 741:27 742:1 772:19

panel 790:26

paper 554:8 594:4 752:16 753:13

paper-driven 706:21 750:17

paperwork 702:2

paragraph 549:10 596:8,16 597:9,22 599:14 604:7,24 605:17 606:1 620:25 621:11,15 622:16 627:13 711:10 713:28

paragraphs 654:12 parallel 548:7 paramount 745:15

paraphrase 711:23

paraphrasing 552:11 668:17

part 520:9 539:20 542:8 547:1,4 569:12 574:6 577:7 581:8 587:18 591:11,12 596:10 597:23 602:14 603:4,21 607:4 611:17,23 613:14 615:10 628:15 630:13, 27 631:10 632:24 633:28 636:23 642:5 643:16.21.22 646:15 659:19 661:14 667:1 669:12 675:23 682:19 696:19 697:12 698:17

708:23 714:19 720:15 721:4 726:26 734:3 736:24 741:2,15 742:12,16,24 743:2 747:21 750:26 754:4, 20,21 760:13 764:8 769:4 771:10 781:3 782:16

Index: open..paying

participants 666:22 667:13 710:9

participate 554:19 participated 556:20 participation 586:8,16 786:10,14

parties 676:19 771:15 partners 711:21

parts 614:12 702:9 732:16

party 531:9 party's 528:27 pass 530:13

pass-through 659:17 passage 560:1 639:15

652:9 713:6,26 passed 654:13

passing 757:12

past 705:13 706:2,5 707:10 710:24.25 728:28 767:25,27

path 557:8 586:5,6 622:4

patience 552:2 647:12

pause 535:17 pausing 667:9

pay 549:18 552:19 553:6,27,28 554:23 569:12 579:26 582:23 604:25 606:27 622:22 623:9,15 669:6 715:8, 28 716:8 722:14 739:2, 8 741:21 747:2 771:28

paying 535:21 623:19, 21 626:21 661:15 716:18 742:2

payment 632:24,27 652:4.7

payments 549:17 570:13 597:23 629:11 739:11

payout 598:2

PC 537:4

peers 741:28

penalties 743:11 744:4

Pender 790:28

Pennsylvania 758:16, 20

people 525:27 596:21 615:28 701:7,24,28 702:23 710:8,20 711:26 715:7 717:1 725:27,28 734:18 747:2 748:21 750:5,13,16,17 751:16 752:12,16,28 755:11, 12,16,27 756:2,4,6,10 757:12 762:10 766:3,5, 13 767:3 769:18 771:25 772:10,12 774:3 777:25 790:27 791:4

people's 751:6

perceive 717:3

percent 521:27 522:3,6 552:6 561:11 564:27 565:10 572:5 584:19 587:21 588:3 596:24 612:7 613:11 615:16 616:23 617:3 641:5 677:8 695:6 698:27 699:1,14,22,27 727:27 761:17 789:26

percentage 610:28 611:4,5 643:19 672:23

perception 675:24 706:6 713:2

perceptions 776:6

perfect 772:4

performance 594:15 664:17,20 697:22 718:8,15,24 719:14,19 720:11,16,25 721:6 724:27 725:20 740:2,6 745:7 747:2 759:25 performance-based 774:13.17

performed 562:13

period 521:28 522:5 558:22 559:14 560:17 563:12 651:4 661:4 709:8 723:22 729:12

permissive 681:23

permit 679:21

person 704:20 717:15, 18 736:15 737:14 777:11 778:24

Personal 545:17

personally 689:15 703:25

personnel 753:27 755:3

perspective 587:22 617:26 618:2,3,4 721:24 727:23,25 779:23 780:27

Peter 516:14

PG&E 517:18,23 518:2, 15,27 519:23,24 521:1 522:25 523:10,15 524:22 527:28 528:15 529:5,17,20 530:25 531:12 537:23 545:8 546:4 547:13,20 548:8 549:14 550:20,21,25 552:8.16.24.25 553:26. 27 554:1 558:12 559:24 560:16 565:25 567:11 570:18 572:18 575:20, 22 576:19 580:25,27 582:9,14,20 583:14 588:2,20 589:4 591:24 595:7,13,15 597:10,17 606:10 608:17 610:4,28 611:27 616:28 620:4 621:21,27 622:8 625:21 626:14,17,19 627:14,26 628:4 630:8 631:6,14 634:24 635:7 636:16 638:6 639:9 641:4,24 642:5 643:1.17.25 644:26 645:6,10,19,25 646:10 648:25 649:9,24 650:23,28 651:8 652:17,20 654:2,21

657:14 658:4 659:22 661:3 663:14 672:6.18 677:22 684:17,23,26 685:14 687:16 689:19 693:2,16 695:5 696:16 697:23 699:9 703:2 710:22 713:9 716:17 717:7 718:26 719:1.27 721:5 725:15 735:23 741:8 742:24 743:12, 13,16 745:28 747:27 749:7 754:17 755:22 757:24 759:7 761:18 762:13 773:1 779:11 780:2 787:15,27 789:10,21 791:14,22,25

PG&E's 518:8 521:19
541:28 542:8 545:26
558:14 561:2 562:2,11
576:21 582:13 586:13,
14 588:16 593:22
594:22 599:15 620:13,
26 621:12,15 622:16
624:7 625:25 627:14
628:22 630:16 631:3
644:18 648:16 649:27
650:20,22 666:18
689:10,20 695:13,18
696:19,22 700:4 702:13
705:2,8 706:5 709:25
723:12,19 775:7

PG&E-1 523:3,5 535:25 542:8 544:3 556:27 580:18 620:21 622:14 630:4 651:13 663:23 664:2 671:9,12 672:5 673:5 685:1 687:20 787:28 790:28

PG&E-12 521:16 635:21 636:14 637:22 640:23

PG&E-13 633:11,20 635:22,24 640:12

PG&E-2 516:26 545:7

PG&E-3 517:2

PG&E-4 517:7 534:5 545:9 685:8,15,17

PG&E-5 685:21

PG&E-6 685:28 734:28 735:2

PG&E-7 545:16 654:10 686:8 791:15

PG&E-8 627:4 628:21 654:8,11

phrase 552:12 635:7 724:6

phrased 604:22

picking 552:23 738:7

picture 702:8 706:28 752:2 768:17

pinpoint 562:27

pipeline 720:21 721:2

place 516:9 545:24 628:14 684:13,16 707:10 732:9,12 733:3, 18 734:4 736:15,28 748:18 787:12,15 789:21

places 593:6 647:4 653:21 709:21

plaintiffs' 617:24

plan 523:14 528:9,18, 24 533:17 534:13,14 546:5 557:26 558:9 559:3 560:21 562:15 563:2 574:22 575:22 577:20 579:7 580:19 583:4 585:2 586:12 599:15 603:24 605:25, 27 611:12 614:2 617:12 618:6.11.14 619:12.16 620:26 621:12,20 622:16 628:23 629:18 631:10 632:14,15,20,25 633:4,6 634:2 638:9,20 645:20 653:19 654:2,4 655:5,10 656:3,14,18, 25 657:15,17,21 658:10 660:12 661:21,26 662:1 664:10,14 666:19,23 667:11,13 670:6,23 672:8 679:3 690:9 696:16 697:12 716:13 747:22 760:12 764:8 771:17,21,24,26 772:23 773:7 774:5 775:26 784:6,15 786:17 789:22

planned 537:19 580:23 planning 775:10 **plans** 579:6 657:18 658:20,24 659:3

Plaster 524:25 525:5, 13,16,28 526:18,27 529:12 666:11

Plaster's 525:11

platform 694:25

play 748:10

playing 760:25,27 785:12

pleased 775:21

pledge 521:2

plethora 751:4

plummeted 596:24

pockets 776:5,16,17

point 529:12 535:15 558:21 563:16 589:21 602:4 619:25 621:27 623:18 625:3 626:19 628:13 631:13 634:15 635:2 643:28 654:5 655:4 659:9 664:7 668:3 692:17 717:4 735:18 754:28 759:5 760:1 779:9

pointed 673:25

pointing 560:4

points 544:5 572:16 592:4 634:12 656:9 670:11

policy 543:20 729:21 730:16 731:2

politics 711:27

pollution 538:19 542:22 577:10,12 579:4,23

Poor's 558:13,23 681:22

poorly 724:6,9

populated 781:23

portfolio 699:10 700:5 789:27

portion 545:26 564:28 722:17

portions 686:16

pose 690:4 691:6

position 523:10,14 628:4 630:16,21 644:19 645:25 654:20,28 659:22,23 684:23 716:5 717:22 718:14 737:19 748:5 757:6

positions 524:19

positive 560:2 575:7 586:9 681:20 747:13

positively 575:19

possession 678:14

possibilities 587:2

possibility 630:25 762:7

possibly 609:18 669:12 697:4 712:25 753:11

post 560:17,21 565:14 634:5

post-emergence

576:21 577:21,24 582:6 661:11 664:16

postbankruptcy 582:14 764:6

potential 527:16 564:8 617:4 676:1,19 677:1, 14 679:19 689:1,27 716:4,23,25,26

potentially 689:5

Powell 790:28

power 637:12 688:27 689:3,11,12,18 690:26 691:5,6,10,12 701:18

powerful 592:11

practice 771:2

practices 693:12 709:3 768:9 769:14 771:9

pre 662:18

pre-2017 662:18

pre-conditioned

605:4

pre-petition 535:16

536:4,13,26 537:4,12, 22 538:4

precedent 580:19,21 583:3

precise 642:22

preclude 613:22

precluded 587:26

precludes 618:2,8,10

precluding 616:2

preemergence 565:20

preference 720:24

preliminary 790:23

premature 771:17

premise 660:9 762:3

prepared 685:2 686:18 770:17 782:27 788:13

prepay 549:11 551:3 552:10

prepaying 549:13

prepayments 548:27 549:9 552:4 679:21

presence 706:25

present 548:22 574:8, 12 662:10 709:9

present-value 668:26 669:8

presented 665:16 667:3 672:3 715:25 782:4

preserve 655:10

preserving 652:22

President 666:11 669:24

presiding 564:4 585:13 676:7,10,23

pressure 746:14 750:14

pressures 746:2 753:12

pretty 687:28 699:14 761:25

prevent 559:24 603:6 789:15

previous 577:14 583:23 633:3 675:28 710:17 728:7

Previously 776:24

price 561:5 590:11 608:14 615:17 617:19 715:11 718:25 760:20

prices 665:8

pricing 571:17,22

pride 746:24

primary 767:22 784:19

principle 660:9 662:13,

principles 660:2,6

prior 537:7 611:6,8 619:14 628:1 662:23 744:21 757:7,10 771:17

prioritize 770:19

prioritizes 736:1

priority 547:9,15 611:24 692:21 693:17 698:13,15 719:4 733:19 742:19 746:7 748:27

privileged 753:17

pro 549:14,18 552:28 585:7

problem 559:20 707:12 708:15 719:5 720:15 734:11 742:24 757:14 768:20

problems 559:23 706:5,7 707:2,9,14,18, 21,24 708:6,11,21 709:5,6 710:19

procedural 556:16 571:5 657:11

procedure 732:9

proceed 647:19

proceeding 566:4 570:6 572:24 581:1,4,9 583:4 587:19 593:21 647:25 659:27 660:1 696:15 734:3 753:22 754:5 771:22 773:11 786:11,13

proceedings 754:4

proceeds 552:6,10,13, 17,18,23,25 553:5,26 572:18 624:21 632:4 677:22

process 573:17 591:13 598:15 599:24 643:17 648:14 653:25 655:17, 25 657:9 658:6 667:27 668:22 676:16 695:16 700:21 701:1,12,16 705:11 706:1 708:17 732:8 734:20 735:19 736:27 763:10 769:5, 21,25 770:2 771:11 772:11.13

processes 697:15 736:14,17 771:19

procure 589:1

procurement 697:16 699:10 700:21,27 701:15,16,17,18 702:10 708:17 771:8,19

Producers 647:24

producing 780:24

professional 528:10, 14 642:11 643:10 646:2,20,22 654:23 659:20 660:17 679:9

professionalism 692:25 693:19

092.23 093.19

profile 528:26

profits 598:2 607:12

program 522:11 591:12

programs 519:16,17, 26 520:2,3,4,5,6,10,17, 21,24,28 521:4,7 522:10,14 562:2 589:20 639:27 640:1,5 756:17 789:11

progress 700:18 727:13

progressive 648:17

project 732:16

projected 559:15

projecting 670:11

projection 578:5 586:13,14 657:6,19

projections 521:24 558:11 571:4,8 578:15 633:12,22,27 634:4,20 635:23 640:13 656:28 657:3 658:11,17 660:25

projects 637:10

promise 551:28

prone 589:2

proper 754:22

property 552:8 570:9 651:10

proportion 699:9

proposal 576:3 719:26

propose 519:5 521:1 574:11,16

proposed 567:22 570:16,17 574:28 575:26 580:28 581:3 582:5,7 586:28 619:12 627:14 632:20 633:4,6 733:18 784:16

proposing 558:8 568:4 605:25 632:24,27 791:14

prospects 560:22

protect 653:11

protection 598:9 626:26 660:11 662:3

protections 567:17 652:22,27 653:13,27 655:11 661:7

protective 626:4

proud 561:9,22

proves 645:9

provide 529:24 572:20 581:24 590:24 591:4, 16,17 598:21 607:3 614:1,3,20 617:26 618:1,5,24 625:22

641:24 655:1 668:15 672:28 697:6 702:12 746:6 754:24 757:16,20 758:2 771:24

provided 530:19 550:20,23 555:4 556:19 579:13 590:28 591:1 597:24 598:14 619:23 642:5 739:11 740:16 758:9 764:6

providing 529:25 548:14 590:23 598:17, 24 609:2 610:5 615:18 618:3.4 655:13

proving 560:20

provision 567:25 568:15,19 677:12

provisions 566:25 567:4 603:5,14,15

proviso 664:22

proxies 747:16

prudent 560:8

PSPS 689:21 707:25 723:13 724:4 726:23 729:24

psychiatrist 750:18 751:5

public 518:8 519:17 520:3 593:18,24 606:13 608:26 609:14 610:7,17 628:5 663:9 688:26 689:11 691:5 694:9 705:24 711:1 729:21 730:15 731:2 733:9 734:15,17 747:26 754:25 786:10,14 791:28

publicly 528:12 530:6 591:8 649:27

purchase 715:7

purpose 519:17 520:3 543:10 566:12 569:10 593:9 626:12 633:27 638:23 757:21 758:1 785:19

purposely 748:21 755:17

purposes 555:19 566:14 754:7 783:24 785:17

pursue 518:27 568:26

pursued 621:21

pursuing 573:2

pursuit 692:27 693:20

purview 751:11

put 528:9,18,24 559:4 592:5 593:18 602:16 623:18 626:3 634:3 639:13 667:11 672:11 673:20 715:21 717:8,16 719:26 741:9,10 748:2, 22 773:26

puts 748:4 789:23

putting 593:22 612:2 666:23 667:14 740:16 741:11

Q

qualify 558:9 722:18

qualitative 527:11 562:25 565:8 662:26 670:22 674:21 675:12 676:3,11,14 677:3

quantification 590:22 591:10

quantified 584:12 quantify 590:18,21

quantitative 526:5 557:25 558:8 563:1 564:12,21 586:11 670:17,23 674:21,22,24 697:21

quantitatively 527:7 563:23

quantity 665:8

quantum 679:2,12,13, 27

quarter 534:1

quarter-related 667:3

quarterly 610:10

quartile 705:21

question 517:24 524:4 525:3 526:9 530:13 534:22 537:15 540:8

Index: questioning..recently

543:25 545:25 550:7 551:9 556:7 557:19 558:19,28 559:11 581:28 583:12 584:22 590:4,13 597:2 600:1, 17 601:9,10,21,22 614:10 618:22 619:8 626:7,10 641:21 642:2, 3 649:17 652:26 658:14 659:7 661:23 666:10,17 669:22 678:18,24 680:25 681:4,5 690:23 691:2 696:28 700:9 705:26 709:13 711:8,13 714:21,28 715:14 717:26 720:4 721:3 725:22 726:11 728:9, 11,15,16,21,25 729:7, 19,28 731:6 736:4,11, 13 737:2,6 738:24 739:20,24 741:3,19 742:28 744:6,8,10 745:14 750:12 752:25 753:5 754:12 759:9,20, 27 760:7,9 761:4,5 762:3,26 764:3 765:1, 18 766:17,22 767:14 771:14 773:3 777:16 778:28 779:3 780:6 785:4 789:6 790:2 791:12.20

questioning 526:7 555:22,25 651:24 676:23 692:3 736:8

questions 529:17 555:17 580:1 587:22 594:6,8 595:12,27 596:3 604:4 609:20,23 614:7 619:9 641:4,6 654:18 655:17 663:11 665:22 666:3 674:9,18 676:6 677:5 678:6,12 679:6,18,23 680:7 681:13 682:8,9,13 691:20,25 692:9 695:21 704:3 724:11 732:24 738:8 774:25 783:18 784:13,27 785:3 786:16

quick 535:17 545:24 548:4 648:14 707:11 723:24 790:13

quicker 770:26

quickly 519:28 529:9 629:1 661:16 768:26

quote 530:1 688:4,5 700:16

quoted 757:28

quoting 562:10 565:28 567:13 700:14

R

racial 769:2,27

raise 528:4 551:17 562:12,16 563:4 581:22,25 585:21 654:5 661:11 666:25 667:8 668:1,4 787:5

raised 593:21 667:17 721:16 732:27 791:12, 21

raises 714:28

raising 544:17 761:10

range 564:24 571:25 578:21 609:11 644:22 752:25 755:15

rata 549:14,18 552:28 585:7

rate 518:28 521:22 522:2.5.11.13.15 561:15 564:28 565:10 566:5,9,21 567:19 572:21 573:15 574:1.8. 15 575:13 577:20,24 578:18,22 582:6 605:18,20,24 606:14 609:6 623:6 624:12 625:11,15,22 626:15 627:21,26 628:23 630:18,25 631:7,15 639:10,13,27 640:1 641:5 645:22,27 646:2, 4,26,28 647:3 648:11 650:9,13,22 658:17,25 660:17,26 662:8 668:13,27 669:4 673:21,26 674:7 677:8 761:23,24

rate-neutral 662:11

Ratemaking 546:22

ratepayer 518:28 519:6 652:16,17,19,21 662:2 671:8,18,24 ratepayers 553:21 583:18 584:15 585:4 624:7 625:10 626:20 640:9 645:11 651:27 652:28 653:5,12 654:25 655:7 657:2,5,13 659:18 660:28 668:21 672:19 696:17 697:10 716:3,22

rates 561:12 562:6 575:1,5 589:6,14,28 603:28 605:26 606:10, 23,27 607:2,8,10,18 608:5,8,18,20 609:1 634:26 639:24 650:7 656:21 660:28 662:21 716:2 760:18,19,21,23 761:2,10,13,15,16

rating 523:18 524:1,6, 12,26 525:6,21,23 526:19,28 527:4,9,14, 21,26 528:1,4,5,6,16 529:2,7 557:27 558:3, 24 559:25 560:1,3,6,14, 25 589:26 604:10,12, 14,21 648:17,18,21,27, 28 649:3,8,13 650:8,16, 22,23,28 662:18,23 670:3,22 672:10,13 675:15 681:19

ratings 523:22 524:16 526:4,21,23 527:16 557:5 559:9,13 562:24 586:19 621:16,23 622:5,9 648:15 649:22 650:12,15 662:25 670:14,16 671:2 672:7 674:20 675:9,11 676:4 677:3 745:9

ratio 635:6,16 675:2

rationalize 781:25

raw 766:4

reach 534:27

reached 662:17

reactive 700:22,26

read 523:8 549:21 550:1 621:9 678:2 689:14 699:3,21 713:8 728:10 758:8 765:25 769:12 reading 636:9

readjusted 724:2

reads 664:27

ready 650:17 674:12 721:3 727:2

real 639:12

reality 657:25 748:26

realization 568:5 569:28 570:11 677:23 678:2

realize 669:19,20 717:26

realized 669:1 731:27

reap 598:1

reason 544:9 615:10 650:1 667:9 706:6 709:23 743:3

reasonable 524:11,13 627:23 643:8 747:4 774:3

reasons 571:20 611:16 651:18 706:7 723:27 750:23 751:18 755:15

reassigned 700:26

rebuild 588:9 597:18 606:15 610:22 613:18 616:12

rebuilding 588:8

recalculated 596:27

recall 567:28 641:6 649:3 679:10 680:13,24 699:12

recalling 680:23

receipt 532:6

receive 529:5,6 604:9 616:11

received 519:24 552:16 564:4 763:20

receives 552:24 553:26

recent 705:13 706:3,17 782:23 783:1

recently 690:8 753:23 756:16 764:7

recess 580:6 683:17 737:27

Rechtschaffen 584:4 666:3,6 671:3 674:18 692:2 774:24,26 775:2 783:2

recognize 558:14 597:18 620:2,4,8 655:2 757:8 766:3

recognized 781:14

recollection 628:6

recommend 782:20

recommendation 719:6,8 720:5,6,7 724:8

recommended 719:1 767:15 782:22,24

reconcile 532:23

reconciles 532:25

reconciliation 534:11

reconvene 790:21

record 516:5 520:12. 13,14 533:21,22,23 534:6,7,9 538:25,26,27, 28 545:11,12,14 549:4, 5,6 550:2,3,5 555:19,21 561:23 580:5,7 584:3 611:23 628:7 629:2,3,5 633:16,17,18 647:7,8,9, 10,15,16,18 661:10 663:18,19,21,22,24,25, 26 665:26.27 666:1 667:1 680:27,28 681:2, 3,8,9,11 683:16 684:5, 14 687:2,3,5 692:1 696:1,2,4 705:22 707:3, 5,7 725:19 737:26 738:1 745:6 747:14 749:14 752:19 783:9, 10,12 786:1,2,3 787:13, 20,21,23 788:4,5,7 790:16,17,19,20 791:23,25

recorded 639:7,9,28

recordkeeping 706:21 707:14,22 708:21 720:22 721:11 730:27 768:14

records 572:28 721:1

749:20 750:5,6,9

recourse 624:6

recover 567:18 645:10, 13 672:18,26 675:26 679:26 716:2

recovered 593:2 630:10 634:21,25,26 640:6 645:3 716:22

recovering 521:6

recovery 573:2 614:27 615:14,23 616:10,17 627:9,15,20,21,26 628:23 630:18,26,28 631:7,11,15 639:10,20, 27 640:2 644:20 645:27 646:2,13,20,24,27 654:25 656:7 657:8,12 660:16 676:2 679:9,14 680:3,11

recross 681:14 682:2,5 784:26

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

681:16 682:11 785:7

recruited 758:17

recruitment 769:25

redemption 567:26

redirect 526:12 586:1 623:27 674:10,15 682:8 690:23 691:24 783:6, 14,16 784:27 785:24 790:10

redone 764:7

reduce 549:11 639:23 764:13,14 779:25

reduced 764:20 780:3

reduces 605:26

reducing 549:13

reduction 575:5 603:28 660:27 673:8

reductions 548:28 552:4 572:21 573:15 574:2 625:22 673:9 789:26

Reed 787:19

refer 530:13 652:5 654:12

reference 520:22 569:3 577:3 579:12 582:21 677:20 688:26

referenced 539:6,14 543:7,13 550:22 569:8 577:17 583:1,27 587:3 629:12 656:4

references 557:11 referencing 576:24 768:13

referred 776:16

referring 527:10 528:6 539:9 544:4 547:7 557:23 565:17 577:23 586:10 591:25 628:22 654:9 661:19 680:22 723:12 734:28 785:13

refers 548:6

refinance 551:23 579:7 582:15,18

refinanced 543:12

refinancing 538:18 542:22 551:7 555:1 579:18 650:21

reflect 547:17 601:15 637:18 640:20 710:28

reflected 531:3 534:3, 23 538:13 541:6,9 612:9 638:8

reflecting 650:14

reflection 527:11 559:16 652:10 715:16

reflective 526:2 573:25 575:28 637:11 655:26

reflects 575:26 636:9

refresh 695:16

refreshment 769:5 770:2

refund 668:28

refunded 585:5

regard 784:5

region 727:20

regional 775:12

Index: recess..release

regionalization 775:7, 16,25 776:13

register 781:10,14

regular 530:16 732:18 736:23

regularly 589:15 736:19.25

regulated 694:14

regulations 770:21

regulator 559:19 696:25 704:16 733:8 746:15 748:4

regulatory 559:17,23 560:12 564:8 635:8,11 675:21 676:16 716:28 731:12 746:12,19,20 747:16,23,24

reimbursed 584:16

reimbursement 520:2 642:21

reinstate 536:23

Reinstatement 536:20

rejections 530:7

rejoined 692:2

relate 536:2 718:9

related 540:13 556:15 588:23 592:21 626:7 631:24 645:21 656:7 682:8 694:7 742:22 754:11 789:27

relates 536:3 575:16 603:28 605:26 652:3 661:8 677:12 695:4 780:7 789:19

relating 649:24

relations 729:5

relationship 543:1 555:7 606:27 607:18, 20,21 608:12 610:21 726:9 768:3 782:13 783:19

relative 680:18 741:28

release 789:7

released 585:14

relevance 763:23,24, 26,27

reliability 716:20 719:10

reliable 694:17

reliably 561:3 696:23 761:28

reliant 588:8 772:24

relief 657:5

relies 574:7,12

relitigate 601:1

rely 654:16

relying 595:1 643:2

remain 565:28 567:13 748:27

remainder 539:22 643:21

remark 762:24

remarkable 782:21

remember 678:28 759:27 773:15

renew 706:10 786:4,6,9

renewable 789:27

reorganization 523:14 575:22 583:5 585:2 603:24 618:12 619:13, 17 629:19 632:15,21,25 633:5,7 634:3 645:20 660:13 679:3 696:16 697:13 716:13 747:22 760:12 764:9 772:24 786:17

repaid 550:11 551:20

repay 551:3 552:28

repaying 550:11 582:16

repayment 624:28 662:16

repeat 524:3 525:3 537:14 559:10 590:12 599:28 600:17 691:1 706:8 714:20

repetitive 717:27

rephrase 739:23 741:2 744:12 760:6

rephrasing 601:8

replacing 741:11 742:19

report 688:20,21,22 697:28 737:20,22 756:1 782:23 785:20

reported 753:7 755:8

reporting 730:26 736:17,19 737:3 780:23 783:19 785:10

reports 688:4,16 737:17 752:14 780:24 782:19,27 783:22,25 785:16

represent 580:15 647:23 687:14 699:28 724:20 743:24

representation 530:24 531:6

representative 572:10

representatives 765:5 769:28

represented 727:17 728:18 729:8 767:16

representing 612:6 617:25 619:7 696:13

represents 602:14 724:21

reprioritize 770:20

request 518:9 529:28 533:4,6 534:19 538:11 542:27 543:2,3 544:26 576:20 581:4 582:13 620:5,10,14,17 641:20, 23 719:28 786:5,7,9 791:20

requested 529:19 530:23 716:22 791:8,19

requesting 534:18 546:4 598:19 630:9 672:16

requests 580:25

require 661:22 662:16 688:4

required 552:18 610:1, 13,15 634:1,3 719:2

requirement 547:8 638:25,28 639:5,6 640:8

requirements 547:2 556:16 615:25 692:24 693:19 789:28

requires 703:1

reserved 666:15

resident 695:6

residential 561:8,16 589:1 590:3

resolution 602:25

resolve 632:8 754:18 763:2

resolved 678:21 682:17,23,24,28 753:23

resolving 632:9

resourced 730:1

resources 697:6,9 721:13 725:26 730:11 748:2

respect 561:23 570:25 577:12 648:11 652:23 660:10 680:17 703:26, 27 719:25 720:7 728:1 730:25 736:13 740:7 784:5,10 785:9

respective 552:9

respond 588:25

responded 626:9

responding 743:17

response 517:23 518:2 529:28 562:24 567:10 579:12 620:5,13,17 633:3 641:20 642:6 680:8,9,19 729:18 754:16 785:3 790:2

responses 518:2,8 719:28

responsibilities 694:23 715:13 719:10 726:2,5 731:4 735:27 782:12 785:16

responsibility 551:24 566:1 567:14 588:12 622:27 623:8,12 687:25 694:16,20,26 696:14 714:13 722:26 729:20, 21,23,26 750:8 781:5, 28 785:9

responsible 626:21 654:14 692:27 693:20 694:16 700:10 710:13 723:16 780:28

responsibly 764:18

responsive 528:17 657:16 702:2 731:6

rest 561:27 791:6

restoring 635:3

restrictions 661:9 662:19 773:26

restructure 759:17

restructuring 698:18 700:28 703:22 729:10 758:20 777:21.27.28

result 570:4 605:23 612:16 650:2 655:22 658:12 660:13 662:11 666:19 673:10 716:20 780:3 784:27

resulted 657:7 725:4

results 597:7 605:18, 19 656:20 658:12 722:6 752:3 755:7 767:21

resumed 516:7,22

retail 779:19

rethink 720:28

reticent 676:20

retire 568:7 624:22

retired 569:28 624:26 625:2

retirement 698:8

return 606:20,24,28 607:25 608:9,22 738:25 741:9 760:28 761:14 772:26 **returns** 761:24 revamped 706:11 revealed 562:20 revenue 638:24,28 639:5.6 640:8 revenues 519:6 521:6 572:25 573:7 review 525:27 662:8 732:18 756:20 reviewed 550:6 665:15 690:8 694:3 705:11 706:1 733:22 reviewing 650:12 698:6 **reviews** 540:10 revised 574:28 revolver 537:9 reward 609:4 rewriting 678:7 **RFP** 771:10 772:21 **RFPS** 701:3 771:19 right-hand 620:12 641:28 rights 616:20,27 **rigor** 763:10 ringfencing 573:6

risk 527:11 528:7 557:28 559:5,8,13 563:7 568:10,22 569:16 589:18,21 590:1,5,8,17, 18,22,23 591:11,12 595:5,18,20,21 596:12 597:6 603:23 656:25,27 657:2,6,19,26,28 675:13,17 677:1 690:4 725:9 726:4 732:7 776:7,20,24,26,27

risks 553:22 594:21 595:2,6,16 657:28 690:28 691:6 726:15 777:1 781:9 782:3

780:10,27 781:4,5,10,

Robert 763:18

14

robust 771:24,25

role 692:15 726:27 736:14,15 737:4 748:7, 8 754:7 757:20,22 758:1 784:1,4,9 785:11

roles 721:28 722:4 730:28

room 519:15 522:25 697:18 757:19 771:15

roughly 532:9 578:23, 26 724:27

RSA 533:14,27 587:27 599:25 600:5,7,8,11,12, 14,20,21,23,24,27 601:19,20,25,26 602:4, 9,19,25 603:5,13,19,20, 27 611:15,18,20 612:1, 5,12,25,26 613:4 614:17 618:2,8,16 619:10,15 643:21 646:23 673:11 678:20, 23 682:16

rule 580:26 712:27 763:26

rulemaking 731:25

rules 546:24 688:1 694:10 716:28 717:2 731:22.27 770:20 773:17,18 781:1

ruling 786:5,25

run 733:2 773:28

running 731:9

rural 789:3

rushed 772:11,13

résumé 704:15

S

S&p 523:22,23 674:25, 26 675:2

S-W-A-I-N-E 642:25

saddles 594:21

safe 598:7 694:17 697:6 705:24 720:18

safely 561:2 631:6 696:23 761:28

safety 581:3 588:24 688:27,28 689:2,11,27 690:5,9 691:5,8 694:24 702:10,18 705:19,21 706:5,11,13,25 708:28 709:26 711:1,2 715:6 718:8,15,22,27 719:3,4 720:10 721:7 724:3,26 725:4,8,19 726:16 730:25 731:14 733:3 736:1 738:26 739:3 740:1 741:22 745:6,14 747:14,28 748:22 749:17 754:21 756:27 759:23,28 764:11,15,21 768:11 773:13 775:8, 19,22,24 777:3,5,7,12 780:7,10,11,12,13 781:5,13,15,16 782:14

safety-oriented 754:19

safety-related 781:20

sale 576:8

sales 552:7

Sam 592:6

sample 753:10

samples 752:28 753:4

San 516:1 555:22 586:20 592:7 675:22 720:13,20 743:19

satisfied 567:20 715:8

satisfy 547:2 551:13 570:15 575:13 612:10

save 623:26

savings 574:23,26 637:25 638:11,23 639:21,26 640:7,20 647:3 655:26 660:17 673:15,18 680:4

savvy 598:8,10

SBA 727:20

scenario 659:4

schedule 568:21 571:5

school 704:23,24

scope 588:22 599:27 600:16 602:21 676:22 690:19

score 700:19

SDG&E 586:25

Index: returns..seek

search 756:18

seated 684:13 787:12

secondary 748:22

secretary 703:22

secretary's 703:15

section 570:18 587:3 636:6 664:5 718:7,11 735:1

sectionalization 690:17

secure 598:26 599:9.17

secured 523:18 524:26 525:6,17,19,20 526:19, 23 533:26 548:16 557:5 558:3,7 579:25 599:12, 21 611:13 621:25 623:14 651:1,8 672:7

securities 543:5 568:13 572:15

securitization 518:27. 28 521:12 568:28 569:4,9,11 570:2,15,25 571:2,10 574:7 576:23 577:1 582:7,8 624:10, 12,17,21 625:6,9 626:18 627:14,26 630:18,22,26 656:2 661:21,22,26 662:12,17 668:9,13,19,23,26 669:3,5,26 670:5,7,12, 19,24 671:8,18,24 674:19,23,27 675:3,15, 27 679:19,20 681:19,24

securitize 519:5 521:2 582:13

securitized 660:22

securitizing 521:6

security 548:21 588:24 598:17,19,21,24 599:7 611:17,21,27,28 612:2 613:1

seek 529:5,6 627:15,19, 20,26 630:18,25 631:14 639:10,20 645:27 646:1,9,11,12,20,23,27

656:6 657:8,12 660:15 679:9,26 680:3 682:26 690:28 786:15

seeking 544:19 546:11 551:25 557:19 601:1 626:18 630:28 631:7,11 644:19 645:12 646:13 654:3,25 655:12 679:14 716:19 791:26

seeks 556:11 645:10 656:14

segregate 566:12 573:7

seismic 778:7

sell 571:2 613:16 614:21,25 615:3,7,15 616:10

selling 613:22 616:2 650:20 699:18,20

Senate 639:16

senior 709:7 710:2,13, 23 777:10

sense 610:18 611:3 751:10 762:20

sensitive 655:20

sentence 586:10 593:16 594:20 596:17 597:27 606:1 621:14 622:3 627:12,24 630:5 634:19 638:10 677:17 678:1

separate 521:13 566:16,17 569:8,14 573:8,10 576:19,22,28 583:13 607:4 619:16 626:16 638:17 656:1 688:10

separately 569:7 573:1 583:22 584:1 637:13

separation 565:26

September 643:6

serve 597:19 638:23 726:20 734:11 761:27

served 628:11 715:26 766:12

serves 702:23

service 607:2 609:3,5 619:25 623:16 669:2,7 689:10 694:18 695:13, 19 696:24 772:22

services 660:18 701:18 715:8 725:14

serving 712:27 715:5 778:11

SESSION 684:1

set 518:3 524:16 530:17 531:17 532:20 584:24 607:5 616:17 636:15 639:7 643:20,23,26 644:7,9,15,16 667:27 693:3,24 718:21 722:19 723:1 728:13 754:3 755:17 790:23

sets 583:6,7,14 706:16 708:24

setting 692:18 723:16 755:26

settled 658:18 683:1

settlement 564:6 588:4 600:7,8 617:8,10, 13,19,20 676:20 682:19,20 733:8 734:1 764:28 766:11

settlements 676:14,18 731:11 762:8

share 561:17 615:17

shared 770:26

shareholder 567:21 568:6 570:1,11 574:9 575:26 576:2 602:15 608:15 616:19,21 661:4 669:1 677:23 712:4,7, 10,15,17,20 715:20 719:3 743:4 760:13 761:11,12,17 762:5

shareholder-certain 572:19 573:13,28

shareholders 540:4 566:2 567:15 570:9 574:5 576:16 592:12 606:5,18 607:13 622:27 623:8,13,17,19 624:27 630:11 651:26 658:23 660:20 661:13,14 711:27 714:2,13 715:3, 22,28 716:5,8,18 717:18 732:28 738:9,15 739:3,9,12 744:17 760:17,18,22 761:24

shareholders' 571:21 609:1.4

shares 587:21 588:5 596:23 597:3 613:11,22 614:21 615:19 617:15, 17 664:18 665:10 764:26 765:10

sheet 539:23 548:5 550:14 554:12 681:25

sheets 534:21 539:5,18 541:3,22

Sheriff 580:8,9,12 581:27 582:2 584:5,6 585:18,28 586:3 587:8 676:21 682:1,2 687:7,8, 10,13 691:3,19,22,27 711:7,12

shift 711:4 729:20

shifted 543:17 729:24

Shippers 647:25

short 530:12 535:26,27 536:1 544:5 581:18 585:12 663:11 692:9

short-term 541:5,10, 27 542:19 543:4,8,18, 22 544:11 551:7 552:21 553:14 554:24 555:11 568:25 569:19 577:16 582:15 583:19 672:17, 20.25 740:15 764:10

shorten 761:7

shorter 690:20

shorter-term 568:27 569:15

shorthand 533:12

shot 744:26 754:9

show 521:21 542:18 638:24,27 668:16

showing 542:11 547:12

shown 521:8 641:9 671:11,21

shows 544:1 643:4

Index: seeking..sizes

Shutoff 688:27 689:12 691:5

shutoffs 723:19

sic 531:28

side 608:20 674:22 675:13 731:1

sight 776:12 778:14,15

sign 619:14 701:4 719:9 771:10

signal 675:18

signatures 600:26 603:18

signed 600:22 602:18 701:5

significant 574:22,26 575:2,4,19 589:5 597:14 602:16 615:17 716:9

significantly 579:24 715:12

silence 603:18

similar 543:3 551:20 555:2 565:14 566:28 593:20 714:10 771:13

similarity 782:21

simple 564:21 706:23

simply 633:21 720:26 740:24 772:16

singular 564:23

sir 699:17

sister 548:6

sit 572:3 639:25

site 689:2

sites 690:5 691:7

situation 563:6 689:7 715:23 716:14 723:1 764:20

sizable 565:1

sizeable 699:9

sizes 727:18

skill 778:25
skills 727:1,4,5 728:6,
15,17 729:7 769:20
770:2,7
skip 760:8
SLA 772:22
slide 521:16 522:26
636:19 637:3,4,21
641:1
slides 636:15

slow 743:18 **small** 672:22 724:20, 21,22 726:8 727:8,15, 19,21,24 728:1 789:1,3

slightly 717:28 718:6

smaller 583:9 690:19

SMAP 591:12

smart 704:25 **Smith** 729:2 763:20

smooth 669:14

snapshot 621:19

SNO 702:13,17,19,22 703:4 726:3 729:22,27 730:5 731:3 736:25 781:27,28 782:14,19,25

SNO's 782:11

social 694:15,19 725:14

socially 692:26 693:20

sold 699:9,22

solely 553:23 623:12

solicited 771:16

solid 614:3 771:20

solution 703:19 708:23

solutions 705:15 708:26 723:24

solved 768:19

solves 742:13

soon-to-be 780:12

sophisticated 702:5

sort 548:6 561:5 584:19 585:7 589:17,28 608:3, 9 611:28 621:19 637:17 672:21 725:3

sorted 564:13

sorts 636:27

sought 593:1 657:5

sounds 522:7 607:16 644:4 720:3 735:24

source 688:7,10

sources 529:19,21,22 530:20 531:7 532:1,24 541:6,7,9 542:18

Southern 560:3,13,18 586:19,24 687:17

space 746:9

span 596:18

spared 608:17

speak 542:5 555:28 557:20 561:2 575:19 598:4 603:11 658:28 696:22 709:8 749:11 767:26

speaking 520:27 523:26 524:15 557:25 701:17 702:4

special 566:12 626:12 694:14 711:22

specific 532:4 534:2 553:20 556:15 565:12 572:22 578:27 609:27 628:26 649:3 659:6 667:10,22 668:14 671:25 677:11 683:2 734:21 736:10 738:21 741:1 751:28 753:9,28 754:3 755:1 768:9 772:26 777:8 782:11 790:3

specifically 521:14 560:4 562:27 566:3,21 598:4 605:2 613:13 626:4 628:18 652:4 656:24 667:20 668:14 694:6 738:8,26 739:5 758:17 773:9 784:9

specificity 653:6 661:6

specifics 521:11 533:1 667:5 726:7

spectrum 739:14 742:2

speculate 528:3 529:1 559:2 595:9 656:16,23 710:7,26

speculating 710:17

speculation 710:10

speculative 527:18

spend 710:19 726:1 747:27 770:17

spending 710:16 720:25 721:13

spent 723:25 746:23 784:6

split 535:4

spoke 701:12 708:16

spoken 768:23

sponsored 521:10 663:15

sponsoring 516:19,25 517:1 619:12,16 685:5, 17,25 686:4,17 788:9 790:27

spread 571:17 572:6 579:22 650:14

spreads 571:25

spreadsheet 563:24

sprinkling 592:10

squarely 670:18

stability 581:24 602:27 603:25 615:18 719:14

staff 750:9

stage 532:7

stages 775:10,27 778:10

stake 765:11

stakeholders 597:20 602:26 603:21 666:27 713:13 714:16,27

stakeholders' 610:24 661:12 670:8

stakeholders-hedge 592:12

stand 516:7 562:15 684:7 702:17 730:14 787:2,5

standard 558:13,22 560:8 681:21 697:3 719:19

standards 655:5,21 658:1,8 692:23 693:18 789:28

standpoint 561:16 562:22 673:25

start 548:15 556:6 594:2 620:3,13 627:8 647:26 682:24 704:14 738:6

started 594:22 595:7 651:24 773:9

starting 519:23 548:28 620:11,18 621:10 622:16 791:5

starts 533:25 534:16 595:15 620:25 622:15 630:5 634:16

state 518:26 562:10 580:24 585:20 598:7 652:23 672:5 684:13 704:16 741:16 758:16 767:12,20 772:7 775:12,13 787:12

state's 554:19 652:4

stated 525:13 529:28 600:21 611:23 650:1 680:9 713:28 742:11 743:3 749:14 757:18,28 759:23 760:3 762:17 775:16

statement 546:13 558:6 583:24 592:17 594:17,25 595:25 596:25 597:11,25,26 598:3 599:10,22 604:19 605:13,16,22 606:17 607:26,28 611:10,22 613:15 615:10 623:13, 21,22 624:7 634:1 636:2 653:8,14 672:12

statements 566:18

592:10,27 791:7

states 523:19 524:2,7 549:9 552:5 593:6 594:13,20 597:9,22 599:14 604:24 605:17 627:13 630:8 634:19 642:14 664:13 **status** 648:5 **statute** 709:23 **stayed** 728:3 **steep** 598:1 **step** 660:21 675:19 691:23 **steps** 565:25 657:20 690:8,14 698:5 752:6 stewardship 719:12 stick 595:26 stipulate 613:27 stipulated 612:24 **stock** 596:27 598:3 608:14 613:16 614:25 615:22 616:1,2,8,9,11, 26,27,28 617:19 665:2, 7 688:1 711:24 712:12 715:11 718:25 762:7 **stocks** 665:8 stone 779:20 **stop** 575:3 **Strauss** 724:15,16,18, 20 730:22 735:17 736:12 737:24 785:2,8 788:24,25,27 789:1 790:7 streamline 701:1,27 streams 587:5 723:26 **stress** 562:13.19 649:18 677:6 **stretch** 734:12 strike 612:13 616:4 708:10,13 **strikes** 708:15 stringent 789:21

strive 781:26

striving 771:27 strong 745:7,9 structure 547:2,6 575:23,25 625:25 664:7 665:1.20 736:1 746:20 747:23 775:12,14 776:2 791:13,18 structured 625:16 626:5 632:7 structures 742:23 749:2 struggling 657:17 **studied** 587:1,4 652:13 studies 570:19 587:3 sub-investment 604:13,15,22 649:1 **subject** 522:4,7 523:25 529:27 530:2 561:4 566:24 567:4 577:9 617:4 625:4,6 639:27 640:1 662:5 678:13.15 679:24,27 680:18 subjective 564:14 589:26 590:6 772:25 subjectivity 564:2 submetric 724:3 submissions 642:20 643:5 submit 610:8 655:19 submitted 591:22 631:4 646:16 690:9 submitting 628:1 subordinate 599:11 subsection 552:5 **subset** 645:5,7,18,21, 23,24 671:10,20 subsidiaries 552:9 substantially 548:22 **subtle** 658:25 success 712:9 739:2

successfully 621:21 **sustained** 613:7 764:2 777:10 **sudden** 691:9 **Swaine** 642:25 suddenly 689:3 switching 633:2 sufficient 694:27 **sworn** 516:17 684:9 sufficiently 668:7 787:8 710:22 sympathetic 606:7 **suggest** 658:7 712:25 727:11 741:21 743:22 **system** 607:11 690:12 752:12 784:8 701:27 707:13,15,16 746:13 750:17 776:8,23 suggesting 547:4 781:3 639:8 749:22 777:20 778:9 **systems** 522:17 697:20 702:4 708:20 suggestion 719:21 768:16 suggests 699:22 systems' 690:16 736:27 785:15 summarize 564:21 Т 679:12 **summary** 534:28 **T&d** 564:28 565:10 642:11,15 707:11 **tab** 731:10 733:25 summer 532:10 613:21 734:27 614:22 table 531:21,28 532:14, **sunshine** 734:19 17,21,24 535:13,15 536:3,13,18,19 537:11 superimpose 746:13 538:15 629:7,8,10 supervisors 706:24 635:27 636:2 640:18 642:6 643:12 671:11,21 supplemental 654:6,9, 672:3 698:21,24,28 10 656:13 686:9 699:21 765:4 **supply** 700:5 703:2 tables 531:17,18 **support** 520:6 582:22 535:13 538:14 597:21 603:23 615:22 tablets 752:21 638:13 646:28 655:13 721:14 730:12 768:11 **tagging** 690:17 supporting 561:23 takes 714:25 719:4 634:4 759:14 778:12 supposed 709:24 taking 538:23 587:28 615:11 645:25 659:23 survivable 564:25 690:7 697:15 779:15 survived 738:17 784:21 survivor 587:17 738:11 talk 535:28 580:19 582:4 586:5 587:24 survivors 682:26 603:7 673:7 675:12 **suspect** 736:22 716:14 717:28 721:20 726:7 730:21 751:21 sustainability 719:11 768:28 778:14 Sustainable 636:23 talked 688:3 721:17 735:13

Index: states..talked

745:25 767:24 768:2

successful 694:21

697:24 719:13

talking 522:9 525:14 535:18 542:25 574:3 631:19 640:14,21 699:18,19 704:14 718:3,12 736:6 758:12 768:12,14 776:20 778:9,18

target 695:5

targeted 527:7 582:16 690:26

tax 570:8,11,13 572:19 573:13,28 579:22 587:5 625:21 677:23,27,28 678:2

tax-exempt 579:14,18

taxable 579:19.23

taxes 522:19

TCC 599:24 600:5,7,12, 14,21,22,26 601:13,14, 19,25 602:3,5,7,13 603:5,6,18,19 611:18, 20 612:1,5,12,25 614:16 618:2,8,16 619:9,11,15 678:20,22 682:16 786:11

team 748:18

teams 723:24

tear 760:27

technical 646:7 688:11,16,20

Technically 535:7

technologies 781:2

technology 708:22 729:15 740:22 755:27 758:28 770:21 778:22, 23

telecom 768:23

telling 772:16

temperate 561:20

templates 752:23

temporarily 541:28

temporary 538:16 542:23 543:8 565:24,27 566:23 567:12,24 568:8,14,24,27 569:13, 27 570:16 582:4 622:21 623:10 624:5,18,20,22, 25 625:1,5 672:22

ten-year 572:13

tend 778:13,15

tension 716:4

tenure 705:7

Teresa 787:19

term 524:13 533:15 534:20 535:7,10 537:8 539:5,18,23 541:3,22 544:6,13 548:5 550:14 554:12 556:15 568:17 584:20 585:8 626:10 642:22 646:5,7 651:21 653:23 724:10 759:28

terminated 750:3 756:6

terms 539:28 540:12,19 549:24 555:2 556:12 565:26 566:28 567:23 575:20 582:28 588:17 600:5 602:3,8 610:15 614:11 618:11 625:27 650:15 652:28 654:21 655:20 660:3,27 691:4 720:10 733:17 743:11 755:20 760:27 768:14 770:15

terrific 778:1

territory 689:10 695:14,19

test 575:14 677:6

testified 516:7 524:26 525:6,16 526:18,27 529:10 669:23 684:9 787:8

testify 700:12 724:1

testimony 516:27 517:4 518:26 521:8,10 523:1 525:11 529:18 531:4,12,25 533:17,19 534:12 535:2,25 536:3, 17 537:1,26 541:16 542:8 545:27 546:8,10, 16 547:13,17,20 550:16 555:5 556:25 566:1 567:14 569:7 573:16 574:28 577:7,18 579:11 582:22 583:2 620:21 622:19 625:20 628:11, 14,25 629:7,14 630:4 631:3 635:13,18 647:3 651:13,14 652:3 653:23 654:6,9,10,17 655:2 656:12,13 663:15,24 664:13 666:9 668:10,12 672:1,5 673:4,14,20,24 678:7 683:14 685:2,10, 18,24 686:4,9,13,22 687:18 692:11 694:4 695:1 696:19 711:6 718:2 719:27 723:9,15 757:26 758:3 760:4 766:24 767:20 771:7 775:4 783:21 785:27 787:27 788:3,10,19 790:14 791:17

tests 562:13.19

tethers 594:14

text 633:21 641:27

thing 611:28 723:5 741:1 746:23 748:20 752:15 756:8 773:1 777:2 778:20

things 526:4 533:2
589:27 607:15 610:16
631:5 638:20 639:15
646:11 651:28 693:25
694:24 700:23 703:16
705:17,26 708:19
721:10 723:21 741:17
744:1,23 745:5,17
747:10,28 748:26
749:16 750:13 751:4
752:13,14 755:25
763:28 766:6 767:9
768:6 770:22 772:22
773:14 775:18 782:24
783:25

thinking 778:6 779:18

third-party 520:4,10, 21,24

Thornburgh 704:22

thought 536:22 550:23 582:1 595:22 612:9 633:1 652:22 749:13, 14,22 751:3 763:15 785:5

thoughtful 759:20

threshold 563:1,9,10, 20 564:10,18,22

Index: talking..tip

thresholds 648:12 678:27

tie 747:24 781:12

tied 588:2 635:5 739:6 772:26,27 773:12

Tier 655:18

ties 774:18

time 516:9 517:15,21, 27 518:6,13,19 530:12 538:20 544:5.14.21.28 549:21 553:28 555:22, 24 557:9 563:12,16 570:12 576:1 578:28 580:3 584:8,13 602:8 605:5 611:27 612:18 613:16,19 614:26 616:11 619:10 621:20 623:27 628:10 631:6 639:13 644:26 646:15 650:11 656:5 659:8 661:5 666:2 667:16 668:4 669:21 680:10 683:15 684:6 687:6 689:15 694:1 701:1 702:1 709:8 710:16,19 721:2 723:22,25 726:1 729:6 731:26 738:2 742:1 746:24 747:5 752:8 753:11,12 756:22 761:1 762:17 763:18 764:6 767:2 768:25 770:16,17 772:28 774:7 779:16 787:1

time-consuming 706:23

timeline 600:6

timeliness 659:26

timely 554:18 653:26, 28 658:14 666:28 676:17 703:23

times 566:6 689:13,19 703:14 721:17

timing 528:14 559:2 570:20 574:9

timings 587:5

tip 659:10

title 546:9 637:25 737:7 785:14 titled 517:17 664:9 today's 516:13 told 704:22 Tom 704:13 tone 692:18 693:3 723:16 728:13 tool 734:6 tools 706:19 747:1 750:16 top 576:12 578:19 759:10 777:6 **topic** 624:10 676:5 **total** 561:9,10,17 682:19 698:28 totally 776:18 touch 577:9 778:16 tough 748:5 towers 752:9 track 561:23 572:27 734:10 732:3 735:11 trade-offs 741:14

617:19

today 516:19 517:15 526:16 572:4 585:23 587:23 639:26 646:10 663:12 696:13 704:2 710:16 725:2 790:14 tolerance 750:4 756:7 629:9 634:12 636:22 638:1 642:14 692:19 693:4 698:13.15 723:17 711:5 721:16 754:11 758:3 766:2 783:21 575:27 605:10 629:12 645:18,23 671:26 672:2 583:20,21,28 639:19 667:1 732:20 733:10 transparency 610:5, tracking 707:13 731:13 traded 528:12 530:6 tradeoffs 741:21 traunch 568:8 **trading** 524:8 572:8,13 treading 572:13

traditionally 756:5 training 747:2 756:9 transaction 519:6 521:12 530:25,27 539:27 546:23 553:23. 24 563:10 564:20 566:15 570:2,26 574:5, 12 577:1 582:7 625:6 679:19 transactions 530:28 531:2 541:23 547:14 551:25 609:27 610:25 637:9 645:19 679:21 transcript 525:27 621:9 728:11,12 758:8 transfers 596:12 transformation 758:14,18,27 778:19 779:6,7,13

true-up 655:25 trust 587:20 597:14,19 610:3,6,12,19,22 transformational 613:10,15,21,23,24,25 729:13 757:17,23 614:17.21 615:3.13.15. 758:11 759:14 777:17, 26 616:9,14,16 747:26 20 778:5 754:26 772:28 transformations **Tubbs** 617:9,14,20 731:25 779:15 632:28 633:4,8 678:19, transformed 779:8,17

treasuries 571:18

treasury 572:6,12

trigger 655:21

triggered 567:25

triggers 653:25

troubles 610:4

788:19

true 592:17 596:25

597:11 598:3 599:8

630:16 670:26 681:22

686:24 714:16 777:2

20 682:16,18,21,25,27

treated 632:14 761:16

572:7

transforming 772:17 Tuesday 628:3 transgression 750:25 **turn** 517:13,22,24,28 518:3,19 519:10 520:19 transgressions 523:1 529:16 530:11 597:16 535:24 536:28 545:4 transition 725:7,11 548:26 556:24 591:21 730:8 619:7 620:5,17,20 622:13 627:3,7 630:3 transitioning 726:2 633:10 635:20 636:13, translation 715:9 19 640:11 641:20 651:12 664:1 679:7 transmission 677:8 692:10 694:5,28 704:8, 707:15 752:9 13 719:1,6 728:8 738:2

16,20,23 701:2 754:21, TURN-X-05 517:25 22.25 TURN-X-06 518:4 transparent 708:18 745:8 **TURN-X-5** 517:22 619:20 620:3 641:19 transpired 600:13 603:9 TURN-X-6 517:28

788:2

619:21 620:8 turnaround 729:16 **turned** 664:3 turning 521:16 537:11 541:4 547:28 552:3 606:4 620:7 641:22 turns 645:5 666:18

Index: title..underlying

treatment 585:7 633:3 two-thirds 664:8 638:17 659:23 678:19 tying 738:25

> **type** 559:20 564:19 571:17 611:17 722:10 771:21 772:23

types 556:21 707:1,9 710:14 730:25.26 763:28 764:5 769:2

typical 553:13 709:19 typically 540:18,23 551:6 556:12 589:27 679:21 750:25 781:23

Uh-huh 615:21 628:20 635:25

U

ultimately 532:8 543:11,23 544:12 551:13 573:1 630:11 639:9 670:1 773:21 781:28

unable 582:14 666:8 739:8

unapproved 582:26 656:4

unaware 556:10 **unbiased** 713:19 714:27

uncertain 679:27 uncertainty 677:1

unclear 655:3 695:25

uncommon 555:6

undercapitalized 666:18,24

undergoing 779:13

underlying 570:10 572:28 616:7,26 699:19 708:16 718:24 739:1

Index: underneath..wait

underneath 601:5 underpinnings 719:12 understand 537:18,24 553:18,23,25 556:14,16 560:5.6 565:11 585:3 588:1,15,27 589:10,20 592:6 595:14 596:2 603:4 604:16 616:20 617:22 622:19 624:26 627:3,19 632:19 643:15 644:12,18 645:17 652:1,25 653:3 654:5 656:23 667:20,23 669:16 670:25 676:25 678:9 682:15,17 691:18 700:8 717:2,22 719:15 720:6,8 725:28 731:1 734:5 735:22 737:5,9

744:7,9,28 747:26

750:8,16 751:5,8

777:19 781:25

756:10 761:20 763:28

771:11 774:11 776:19

765:7,15,16 766:1,2

understanding 570:22 575:15 589:13,24 590:15 592:16 593:27 594:3 599:23 600:3 602:8 604:11 609:28 614:16 637:28 651:19 652:10 656:19 657:10 659:25 673:13 682:23 687:21 705:14 719:17, 23 726:24 744:15 747:11 775:26 777:4 784:4 786:18

understands 731:18

understood 569:2 575:14 628:10 653:27 765:26 773:20,27 776:11 782:3

undertake 668:4 710:11

undertaking 589:20 735:27

underway 782:25 underwrite 591:6

unfair 616:4 662:22

unfairly 599:15

unfettered 688:25

unfortunate 587:27

unilateral 612:11

United 523:19 524:2,7

universal 563:11

universally 770:25

unknown 617:15,23

unlike 709:18

unpack 526:3

unpredictability 676:15

unsafe 708:1 739:7

unsecured 524:1,6 525:15,17 526:28 527:4,14,16,21 528:1, 16 529:7 557:13,24 558:4,6,25 559:25 560:24 576:8 586:19 611:6,12 621:28 651:3

unusual 691:23

upcoming 661:8

updated 732:21 734:16

updates 788:16

updating 659:16

upfront 576:1 667:15

upgrade 529:2

upside 608:19

Users 647:24

utilities 525:7 530:4 540:11 593:19,24 606:13 675:25 694:8,17

utility 523:10,15,19
524:2,7,11,15,19,22,27
525:21 526:2,25 527:1,
9,14,20 532:25 535:19
536:12,20,26 537:4,20
538:16 540:3,6 542:21,
24 543:8 544:3 545:4
548:24 551:14 555:8
557:13 565:24,28
566:23,25 567:12,24
568:14,24 569:27
570:16 574:24 581:22
582:4,23 583:20 622:21
623:11,15 624:4,5,6,18,

22,25 625:1,5 626:16 637:16,19 640:8 646:9 647:27 648:6 650:7,9 651:21,24 652:2 676:4 677:15 678:15 694:11, 12 696:25 697:3 702:20,24 712:28 714:17 724:20 733:1 739:4,6,14 741:24,28 770:23 771:1 779:6,12 789:2 791:24,27

utility's 529:20 557:24 558:24 648:10 678:13, 26 679:4 688:27

utility-owned 698:7 utilization 573:19 utilize 573:15 574:1 utilized 695:27

V

vague 736:11 775:28

Vanguards 773:23

variables 617:16

variety 541:14 692:15 750:12 751:27 755:25

vast 775:22

vegetation 690:16 707:21 740:4 789:9

vehicle 566:12

vendor 712:23,28

vendors 711:26 712:22

verifiable 773:12

verification 523:25

version 674:4

versions 703:3

versus 544:6 591:17 604:16 701:18

Vesey 703:9 730:24

vested 606:19 687:27

viability 712:8

victim 570:5 587:25 596:2 608:2,13,16,20 616:14 617:11 738:12

760:11,28 761:11 764:25 767:16

victims 554:22 582:17, 24 587:18 588:3,4,8 595:1 596:7,13 597:4, 15,20 598:10 599:8 602:14 606:4,14,18 607:21 610:17 611:18, 25 612:1,3,7,14 613:18 614:27 615:6,24 616:7, 11,18 617:16,25,28 618:3 661:13 682:18,21 765:11,24 771:15 772:1,7,18 786:12,16

victims' 594:14 595:16 599:16,19 613:10 616:15 738:13

view 681:19 770:25 775:6 777:16 779:4

viewed 712:11 776:25

views 659:17 676:9 705:17

violations 754:3

virus 554:16

visibility 658:19

visible 693:14

visited 743:21

visits 693:10 726:21

visual 530:24 531:5,6,8 740:23

visualize 563:24

vitally 653:16

voices 786:12

volume 534:5 685:2,4, 9,23 686:2,12 787:27 790:28

volumes 534:12

voluntarily 733:28

vote 616:22 617:2,12 618:6,13 634:2 771:16

vulnerable 762:18

W

wait 585:26 753:15

715:10

well-known 768:19

waiting 743:10,14,23 well-managed 745:2,6 witness's 762:27 waivers 546:4 well-trained 748:18 witnesses 790:23 walk 546:10 592:3 Wells 516:6,17,24 woman 735:6 **X-9** 591:22 518:24 540:9 550:6 **walked** 701:8 women 769:8 770:8 556:4 580:13 582:4 wallet 561:17 617:23 587:15 591:28 593:5 word 618:19 696:26 619:6 624:3 627:2 711:8 723:14,18,20 wanted 560:5.6 577:9 **Yap** 791:1 628:13 630:3 631:18 724:7 628:7 668:8 717:27 633:15,20 635:1 639:12 year 522:2 535:8 731:28 747:7 777:15 words 594:3 715:11 640:26 644:4,21 646:7 779:9 578:24 584:19 604:25 647:11,22 659:10 **wanting** 659:27 605:14 634:8 638:2,5 663:1,7 664:1 665:3,5, work 570:3 639:22 641:5 719:20 762:13 ways 692:15 700:13 23 666:8 671:7 674:17 647:27 648:2 656:21 768:1 722:4 744:21 745:8 683:13 760:15 660:27 666:26 667:12. 746:21,22 770:14,27 year-over-year 521:26 18 672:13 690:15 Wells' 791:17 771:5,13 693:23 698:16 701:13, yearly 669:18 wholistic 557:27 weaker 763:13 26 720:17 723:26 years 559:9 560:27 727:13 732:4 756:17 wide 760:20 776:4,28 website 707:25 768:21 571:16 579:1,24 wide-ranging 708:11, 584:14,16 585:6 664:24 week 524:25 525:5 worked 613:13 614:24 669:4,18,19 696:11 546:10 554:16 572:8,10 25 666:21 694:13 730:6 705:22 706:3 727:21,28 619:26 628:3 654:7 widely 708:6 750:24 755:24 763:2 767:25,27,28 772:6 695:28 791:6 768:22 782:1 wildfire 519:1,2 554:19 years' 669:7 weeks 569:10 570:27 570:4,6 582:17,24 worker 688:28 689:1, 668:24 739:15 yesterday 516:16 27 690:4 691:8 586:8,16 587:17 591:10 526:27 529:10 564:4 595:8,15,20 597:3,6,19 weighted 571:15 working 613:28 626:5, 703:9 606:4,11 613:20 572:14 673:27 674:6 25 662:3 671:28 689:24 614:22,27 622:22 yield 574:22 740:15 697:27 700:12,28 Weissmann 516:17, 623:3,7 625:4 627:9,16, 701:22 723:23 732:11 20,21,23 517:10 525:2, 27 628:24 630:9 631:8, **York** 688:1 711:24 747:10 756:18 758:22 10,14,18,24 537:14,25 712:12 9 632:1,2,13 638:18,19 768:3 771:23 539:8 547:22 558:16,26 649:23 650:3 652:5,8 568:1 585:26 588:21 654:22 661:13 675:23 works 553:24 554:27 590:9 592:19,24 593:28 680:12 682:26 690:8 563:23,25 715:17 595:24 599:26 600:15, 708:28 711:2 716:1 world 657:24 660:22 28 602:20 613:5 614:5 728:27 729:24 738:11 620:27 621:2,5 629:16, 772:4 756:13,15 760:28 17,18,22,26 661:18 767:16 784:6 790:4 worn 761:6 673:2 674:11,13,16 677:4 678:11 680:26 **wildfires** 589:5,19 worry 584:24 594:22 596:20 631:11, 681:6,12,18 684:19,21 worth 584:16 16.20 634:17 653:2 686:27 687:1 691:1,26 659:18 708:2 745:14 736:3 739:19 742:25 write 584:9 585:9 780:4 789:7,15 744:5 753:15 757:25 592:25 758:2 759:26 760:5 willingness 742:5 writing 584:20 719:2 761:3 762:22 763:22 wires 596:19 766:18 773:2 783:5,7, **written** 786:19 13,15,17 784:23 with-long 544:13 wrong 520:1 604:27 785:24,25 787:17,18 607:17 618:19 657:3 790:10 791:10,11 withdrawn 656:15 721:11 723:18,22 well-being 714:18 withholding 630:22 744:16 745:18 750:14,

Index: waiting..York

X

Υ

15,20

662:15

withstand 563:3 565:2